

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS

TERMS—\$2.50 a year, in advance.

75 cents per copy.

THE 467346

LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

CONDUCTED BY

JAS. W. RICHARD, D. D., LL. D. J. A. SINGMASTER, D. D.
FREDERICK G. GOTWALD, D. D.

WITH THE SPECIAL CO-OPERATION OF

PROF. S. A. ORT, D. D., LL. D. PROF. F. D. ALTMAN, D. D.
PROF. ALFRED HILLER, D. D. PROF. F. P. MANHART, D. D.
PROF. J. L. NEVE, D. D.

VOL. XXXIX—NO. 1.

JANUARY, 1909.

Entered at the Gettysburg Post-office as second-class matter.
GETTYSBURG, PA.

COMPILER PRINT
1909

*DA

CONTENTS.

I.	PERSONALITY	1
	BY PROFESSOR CHARLES W. SUPER, LL.D.	
II.	THE MODERN CHURCH AND THE SOCIAL CRISIS	13
	BY EDWIN HEYL DELK, D.D.	
III.	THE BIRTH AND CHILDHOOD OF JESUS.....	31
	BY REV. WILLIAM WEBER, PH.D.	
IV.	THE CHRISTIAN CONCEPTION OF GOD.....	48
	BY W. H. BRUCE CARNEY, A.M., B.D.	
V.	THE APOLOGETIC VALUE OF ST. PAUL.....	63
	BY CHARLES WILLIAM HEATHCOTE, A.M., B.D.	
VI.	THE POSITION OF THE CHURCH COLLEGE.....	75
	BY L. E. WOLF, D.D.	
VII.	CHARGE TO PROFESSOR LOYAL H. LARIMER, A.M..	85
	BY LEANDER S. KEYSER, D.D.	
	THE NEED FOR POSITIVE PREACHING.....	90
	BY PROFESSOR L. H. LARIMER, A.M.	
VIII.	THE PLACE OF CHRIST IN AN ADEQUATE THEISTIC BELIEF	105
	BY JOHN A. M. ZIEGLER, PH.D., D.D.	
IX.	"CHRISTIAN WORSHIP: ITS PRINCIPLES AND FORMS."	113
	BY PROFESSOR JOHN O. EVJEN, PH.D.	
X.	RELATION OF THE GENERAL SYNOD TO THE LUTHERAN CHURCH.....	131
	BY J. M. REIMENSNYDER, D.D.	
XI.	REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.....	141
	Jerusalem—The Cities of St. Paul. Their Influence on His Life and Thought—A Short Grammar of the Greek New Testament—The Future Leadership of the Church—Science and Immortality—Reli- gion and Medicine—A Guide to the Study of Church History—The Epistle to the Hebrews—The Educational Ideal in the Ministry— School Reports and School Efficiency—The Beliefs of Unbelief—The Incarnation and Recent Criticism—Foreign Religious Series—The Book and the Child—A History of the Ancient Egyptians—Encyclo- pedia of Religion and Ethics—Mission Studies—Wilhelm Loehe. Ein Lebensbild von Karl Eichner—The Psalms.	

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

CONDUCTED BY

J. A. SINGMASTER, D. D.

FREDERICK G. GOTWALD, D. D.

WITH THE SPECIAL CO-OPERATION OF

PROF. S. A. ORT, D. D., LL. D.

PROF. F. D. ALTMAN, D. D.

PROF. ALFRED HILLER, D. D.

PROF. F. P. MANHART, D. D.

PROF. J. L. NEVE, D. D.

NEW YORK
PUBLIC
LIBRARY
VOL. XXXIX.

Entered at the Gettysburg Post-office as second-class matter.
GETTYSBURG, PA.

COMPILER PRINT
1909

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
467346
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS
R. 1910 L

MAJ WEN
3184
Y8A981

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

JANUARY, 1909.

ARTICLE I.

PERSONALITY.

BY PROFESSOR CHARLES W. SUPER, LL.D.

The historian Herodotus informs us that when Xerxes was trying to force his way into Greece through the pass of Thermopylae, without success, he found in his army many combatants but few warriors; or to put the statement more in accordance with the Greek idiom, many men in form but few men in spirit. This anecdote recalls the story of Diogenes who was one day walking in the streets of Athens carrying a lighted lantern, and when asked why, replied that he was looking for a man.

The latest edition of *Who's Who in America* contains brief biographies of over sixteen thousand men and women. It was the purpose of the compiler to include all persons who had gained more or less prominence in some sphere of activity. The volume embraces names of persons who had won a merely fortuitous importance while, on the other hand, some who are more worthy are omitted. Still, the list must be regarded as a fair one, the unimportant inclusions about balancing the important exclusions. In the United States, therefore, about one person in five thousand has risen above mediocrity. At first thought one would be inclined to place the number higher, but a glance at the names in the volume shows that it is sufficiently comprehensive. It must be kept in mind, however, that fully one-fifth of the number of persons enumerated in the census is under twenty

years of age. This would accordingly raise the proportion of leading men and women by the same fraction. It is hardly an exaggeration to say that about sixteen thousand people do practically all the thinking for some sixty ^{million} (thousand) adults in this country. The number is relatively somewhat higher than the German *Wer Ist's*, but the names are not selected with the care shown in the American volume. Whether Homer ever lived or not, or Lysurgus, or even Moses does not concern us here. That all antiquity assumed their existence is evidence that unsophisticated man can only think concretely. It is not easy for even the mature man to form an idea of God without giving to him a human form. Yet the Bible constantly reiterates that He is a spirit. The more I study ancient history and compare the records with those of recent times, the more fully I am convinced of the folly of attributing great events to the combined activity of masses of men acting without leaders. Nevertheless there are modern writers not a few who would have us believe that Abraham and Moses and Joshua and many others are simply the personification of tribal or national activities and strivings. The same scholars have no doubt of the existence of great leaders in ancient Egypt and Babylon,—why not apply the same canons of criticism to the annals of those countries which they apply to the Hebrews? .

It is hardly an exaggeration to say that the more thoughtful portion of the German people aspired to unity for almost a thousand years. What did their hopes, their prayers and their writings looking to this end amount to? Practically nothing except to keep the subject from falling into forgetfulness. But when Bismark came upon the scene affairs took on a new aspect. Abstract ideas and unrealized ideals, sentimental politics, national longings were translated into actions. Soon practical results began to follow. The final outcome was that what had been striven for and hoped for generation after generation was made real in less than a decade because the man had appeared who may be said to have been the embodiment of the psyche of almost an entire people.

The world has only moved when it had strong men for leaders. The same may be affirmed of nations. But the movement has not always been forward. Jenghis Khan and Timor the Tartar

wrought such havoc in Asia that to this day it has not been wholly repaired, nor indeed can it be. The same may be affirmed with somewhat less positiveness, of Charles V, and Philip II, of Spain, and of Wallenstein. Nevertheless the nation that depends too much upon the strong man leans upon a fragile reed that may break at any time. Frederick the Great raised Prussia to the first rank among European states. In less than a generation after his death the same state lay prostrate at the feet of Napoleon. The people had not yet learned to rely upon themselves as they did a few years later.

The pernicious influence that may be exerted by the class of men called by the Greeks *demoniac* is strikingly exemplified by the career of the first Napoleon. His success blinded the French people to the vicious manner by which it had been gained. His early conquests were a benefit to nearly every country in Europe. It represented national aspirations. But almost as soon as he realized his power he became inordinately selfish. He ended his life in disgrace, and his countrymen who abetted his evil deeds had to expiate them with him. The truly great man is he whose work is permanent, in statesmanship, in literature, in art, in science, in morals, in religion, or in whatever it may be. Real greatness is unselfish just as real patriotism is. It is significant of the change of public opinion even in France that a few years ago when a French publisher asked his countrymen to declare by vote whom they regarded as their greatest man Napoleon was put in the fourth place. For their war-idol they substituted men of peace. The people of any country may be compared, in masses or strata, to pyramids. The base, which is the broadest, represents the common man. Although he has his uses he pursues the unthinking tenor of his way from generation to generation. He does no thinking for himself and risks no innovations. A little farther up on our pyramid is a layer composed of men who are not bound by use and wont in every little thing, but in most. So we may go upward until we find at the top the one conspicuous man of the day; for though not all may be agreed as to who it is there is rarely a difference of opinion that one man should occupy the highest place. The same illustration may be used of every calling in life. It is a significant sign of the inherent tendency to hero worship, to lean on authority and

of the difficulty men have in finding the truth or of the aversion to seeking it that they almost invariably look to another rather than to their own efforts. This may be so because So-and-So says it is. When as a boy I wanted to find out anything I used first to ascertain what the book said even on matters that I might just as well have found out for myself. It never occurred to me that if the man who made the book correctly described an object with which I was, in a general way, familiar, he must have examined it just as I could do. This is the state of mind that produced the stagnation of the Middle Ages. For a long time everybody accepted the dictum of some church father or of Aristotle as if it were inspired, although they nowhere profess to be infallible. What has been the attitude of the masses in the past toward the innovator? Almost invariably hostile. When the Hebrew prophets plead for a simpler life, for a departure from the new courses into which their people had almost unwittingly fallen or been led by their rulers, they met with persecution. "We have to go with the crowd" was the watchword. Anaxagoras was banished for impiety. Socrates met with what most persons would call a worse fate. The man who thinks differently from the mass stirs up trouble. His doctrines are condemned as revolutionary, when often this is the best thing that could be affirmed of them. Luther was always willing to discuss his new teachings with his opponents and to retract if found in the wrong. His appeal lay in the Scriptures. Yet his opponents, when they professed a willingness to argue with him, wanted to have him accept the interpretation of God's Word as given by the Church. The Calvinists in France again and again demanded an opportunity to meet their adversaries in open discussion, but it was denied them, or the case prejudged against them. To make man worse often is simply to make him different from the majority. Christ and His disciples were condemned because their teachings subverted the traditions of the elders. What a man does and what his manner of life is ought surely to be regarded as of vastly more importance than what he believes in a transcendental matter. What was the condition of communities in the remote past? We can form a fairly correct conception by examining it in its lower strata today. There was hardly any individuality: it was a mere mass. Every man did just what

every other man did; each believed exactly what his neighbor believed. Everybody was circumscribed by the narrow circle of beliefs and customs which he had inherited. Macchiavelli expresses this fact somewhat thus: "Men, at any given period, must necessarily be in the debt of the dead; the masses can not help following the beaten paths; the tendency of history is not to initiate, but to reproduce in a debased form. Men, being lazy, are more willing to conform than to pioneer; it is less inconvenient to persecute than to tolerate."

According to our modern ideas of justice the treatment accorded to Achan as narrated in the Book of Joshua was a grievous wrong. His family and even his property were held to be participants in his crime. Albeit this was not a unique instance of the primitive mode of administering justice: in fact it was the rule. When Xerxes had invaded Greece and summoned the city of Athens to surrender one of the citizens proposed that his terms be accepted. He was stoned to death by his fellow citizens and the same punishment was dealt out to his wife and children by their wives. Different ages differ more widely from each other than different peoples in their ideas of justice and as to what constitutes a crime and its fitting punishment. Where there is an organized police system and regularly constituted tribunals for the apprehension and punishment of criminals it is usually a hard matter for the criminal to escape. Where society is loosely organized the situation is altogether different. Each member of the community must be made responsible for the conduct of every other member. There can hardly be said to be any individuals. In later times the Jews themselves began to recognize this and to dissent from the ancient teachings. Jeremiah (Chap. 31) reminds his countrymen that "In those days they shall say no more, the fathers have eaten a sour grape and the children's teeth are set on edge. But every man shall die for his own iniquity: every man that eateth the sour grape, his teeth shall be set on edge." In like manner Ezekiel does not believe that children shall suffer for the sins of their parents. "But if the wicked turn from his wickedness, and do that which is right and lawful, he shall live thereby." (Chap. 33.)

At this time the individual began to emerge slowly. The modern conception of personality was making itself felt. We have

not yet outgrown the notion that family connections have something to do with character. And doubtless it has. It is at least a slight recommendation if it can be said of a man that he belongs to a good stock. Only the other day a neighbor of mine remarked incidentally when speaking of an acquaintance that he belonged to the lowest of the low. Yet he is not what can be called a bad man; he is simply a nobody. The Declaration of Independence declares that no attainder of treason shall work corruption of blood. It is well known that in England until comparatively recent times certain offenses involved not only the criminal but his family and his posterity. There was not even the disinterestedness that characterized the ancient Hebrews when they executed the commands of Joshua. They were ordered to destroy the property of Achan because it was considered tainted. The English sovereigns confiscated the property of offenders to their own use. It was no longer tainted after the transfer. The tribal idea, the notion that we owe nothing to any one outside of a narrow circle of actual or supposed relationship dominates the entire ancient world. The priest and the Levite who passed by the wounded and stripped Samaritan were not exceptionally heartless according to the code of their day. They did not understand that they owed anything to a member of a despised race. They would doubtless have treated a fellow Jew differently.

Altruism is essentially a modern product. The solidarity of the human family was first recognized by the early Christians, and by them very gradually, at least in practice. When the social equilibrium is disturbed man naturally falls back into his primitive bestiality. This was demonstrated over and over again during the Thirty Years War no less than in the early rush to California. It can be seen at any time when there is a free distribution of desirable objects. People will push and jostle one another in the mad rush to be first. Perhaps there are instances where one touch of nature makes the whole world kin; it is more natural for every man's hand to be against every other man. When speaking of the great storm that devastated Galveston one writer said: "Men and women who had long been united by the bonds of social union were so suddenly thrown back upon their primitive natures, and the fierce struggle for life was realized in

its most acute form. Brother flew at the throat of brother, friend wrestled with friend to obtain a glass of water or a mouthful of bread, and scenes of the most frightful description were witnessed in which men and women struggled for the simple fact of their own existence. Face to face with the primeval factor of self-protection, the whole finely elaborate superstructure of altruistic socialism fell to pieces. We read in the frequent accounts of shipwreck that a boat full of survivors for a time were sunk or overturned by those who were still in the water struggling madly to be taken in, when even the addition of a single person meant certain destruction to many. When the representatives of the law are powerless or absent plunderers are the order of the day. And they justify their course by the argument that they are only getting back or taking away illgotten gains. When civilized men in any considerable number pass beyond the pale of the laws under which they lived, it becomes necessary to form a compact for mutual protection; in other words, each man feels obliged to pledge himself to stand by the other against those who are disposed to take advantage of the isolation of new settlers." The evolution of the individual has been a long and tedious process in the world's history. What an endless procession of men and women pass before our mental vision when we read the Bible through consecutively! How little do we know of any one of them! How valuable to us would be an account of the conditions in Egypt during the early years of Moses or of Palestine under the reigns of David and Solomon! How much we would give for his own record of the system under which Saint Paul received his education! And so on through the series. It is true we have many modern books professing to furnish us with this information; but as hardly any two agree they are of slight value. We get glimpses of men in connection with the events with which they are more or less identified, but of the men themselves we have scarcely more than a shadow. The same may be said of Greece. During the half century preceding and succeeding the year 400 B. C., about a score of men lived temporarily or permanently in Athens who have influenced the thought of the world more than any one thousand living at any other period of the past; yet their combined biographies would fill only a small volume. Considering the time in which he lived, Thucydides

was a greater historian than all his successors; what do we know of his life? Not enough to fill a very small page. The first forty years of Socrates' life are a blank, and of the following thirty we get but an occasional glimpse. To posterity he has become important because of his doctrines and his disciples, not because of himself. The early history of Rome is marked by great deeds; there seem to have been no great men, at least none who rose high above the common level. Julius Caesar, taken all-in-all was the most remarkable personage of antiquity if not of all time. He was not only a warrior; he was a profound scholar, a masterly writer and a consummate orator: "a writer and a fighter" as Miles Standish expresses it. Yet Froude calls his Caesar "A Sketch," because materials for a life do not exist. In the first Christian century Plutarch compiled a series of Parallel Lives. They are not biographies in the modern sense of the word, since they were composed to convey moral lessons rather than to tell the truth, especially the whole truth. Suetonius "Lives of the Twelve Caesars" makes but a small volume; yet how many stirring events took place in their day. A modern biographer will make a large volume or more than one, in setting forth the career of a man or a woman whose days were almost entirely spent in writing and thinking. Such books are studies of mentality, of development. They endeavor to give us an insight into the psyche of the hero or heroine and are not mere narratives of deeds. If such were their object there would be little to tell. So far as I know Saint Augustine was the first man to write Confessions; to set forth in an orderly and consecutive manner his inner experiences. It is rather a tiresome book to read, but it opens a new world to the student who has confined his reading to the pagan and even the Christian writers who preceded him. Few scholars, I apprehend, realize the full significance of these confessions in the history of human development. The careful reader of history, if he judges it from the ethical point of view, can not have a very high opinion of mankind. Blindly and unconsciously the mass has set itself against looking at facts. It is a sad truth that the majority of men do not change their opinions after they are thirty-five or forty. Before reaching this age many are content to remain a part of the immovable multitude. Thinking is such hard work that they do not want much of it.

Many a time in the past we may learn how difficult it was for new ideas to make their way even when they could not possibly do any harm if accepted. The Jews tried to kill Saul, not because he was doing them any injury, or because he was endeavoring to subvert their doctrines, or because he was a man of bad life, but because he had come to differ with them. In a measure, such things are continually occurring. If in common with ten men I hold a certain opinion for a time, then change my mind, the probability is that seven or eight will cherish ill-will toward me for the reason that my surrendering a belief which I once held and which they still hold, seems to be a reflection on them and a sign that I think myself wiser than they. It needs to be said, on the other hand, that the principles of conservatism are not necessarily vicious. There is need of discrimination. So many persons are kept within bounds solely by the framework of the institutions amid which they have been brought up and to which they have become accustomed that when these are removed all constraint and restraint are taken away. Experience has abundantly proved that laws are often unjust. But anarchy is still worse. Law is at least regular and systematic in its operations; lawlessness is usually unrestricted plunder. It is rare that a man or a coterie of men who are bent on the subversion of society are unselfish. To use the phraseology current in our day: the man who is trying to overthrow a boss usually wants to be a boss himself. When he does not, the public is confounded. Brutus stabbed Caesar, not so much because he was a menace to the liberties of Rome as because he was dangerous to the prescriptive prerogatives of a privileged order. There was less danger that he would oppress his country than that he would curtail the tyranny of the senatorial clique. In the beginning of the fourteenth century Cola di Rienzi was moved to pity when he contemplated the misery of the poor of his native land. But no sooner had his reforms began to take root than he lost his head and virtually made himself an oppressor in the room of those he was trying to dislodge. When Luther began to preach the right of private judgment in matters of religion and in the interpretation of the Scriptures the Anabaptists in Muenster forthwith abused the doctrine and speedily brought about a condition of affairs that was far worse than the old order. No government could counte-

nance such innovations and exist. We might have seen the same things in France when the revolution broke out had we been privileged to be present. After the radicals had destroyed the hereditary aristocracy they began the work of destroying every man who was in any respect superior to the rabble. They wanted to bring about equality, not by elevating those who were at the bottom of the social scale but by extirpating all who had risen above the common level. The tendency among men to gravitate into groups is as strong as ever. There are probably a hundred fraternal orders in the United States. The various ecclesiastical bodies have nearly all their auxiliary organizations. There is an infinite number of societies for an endless variety of objects. But the attractive and cohesive force is no longer one of heredity: it is voluntary. This force is, in many cases, operative across international lines and has called into existence international bodies. Coöperation and combination are in the air. We are almost as much in danger of losing our individuality as if we belonged to one of the castes of India.

On the other hand the very fact of membership in all these bodies is voluntary leaves a good deal of elbow-room. Many of them, moreover, have a distinctly moral or religious object; none of them are avowedly immoral and few admittedly irreligious or non-religious. Nevertheless there is a real danger that the individual may be lost sight of, or that he may lose sight of himself. There is accordingly an urgent need of men and women who will assert themselves and take a firm stand against all forms of vice and corruption. If such individuals can not carry the group with them they had better act for themselves, let the consequences be what they may. It is the strong bird that "flocks by itself." Never in the history of the world has the larger public been so ready to respond to an appeal to man's better nature; never was there so little risk for those who stand for truth, for morality and for genuine religion. It is frequently urged by men in positions of more or less public nature who are conscious of having done what is contrary to good morals that they were the victims of a vicious system; that they had rather do right than wrong, but that in order to accomplish anything they had to "train with the gang." If this excuse is valid the world

would keep on getting worse continually. Such conduct has not even the justification of those who are born into a caste: they deviate from the path of rectitude by their own will, or at least they are willing to act in contravention of better principles. We are not responsible for what we get by inheritance; we are responsible for the course we choose when two or more courses are open to us. It is every man's duty to stand squarely for the right, and if need be to fight for it leaving the consequences with Providence. The strong man can do a great deal; but even the ordinary man can do something. Nobody has a right to plead his insignificance. On moral questions every one counts for something if it be only by abstention from what is obviously wrong, or questionable. We have no reason to believe that in the final adjudication of rewards and punishments the Righteous Judge will excuse any man because he found himself in bad company. It can not be too often asserted or proclaimed with too great emphasis that the most urgent need of our day is men who are not afraid to assert themselves; who are always prepared to make themselves nuclei around which the better elements in every community may rally. Seneca long ago warned his protege Lucilius to beware of the crowd: the admonition is just as timely now as it was eighteen hundred years ago. What is the use of all our educational machinery if not to increase the number of men and women who have the courage of their convictions? On the other hand, there is danger that we may mistake obstinacy for firmness, a whim for a principle, a strong won't for a strong will. We all know men who will never follow anybody and whom nobody will follow. They belong to the so-called class of cranks. They are usually men who mean wisely and act foolishly. Furthermore we may lay undue stress on non-essentials. If there ever was a man who would not compromise on matters of importance it was St. Paul. But what does he say as to mere personal matters. "Therefore, if what I eat makes my brother fall, rather than make my brother fall I will never eat meat again." And this: "Everything is allowable for me! Yet everything is not profitable! I will not let myself be enslaved by anything." The importance of self-effacement for the good of others pervades his writings. We find the same principle

enunciated by Christ: "Whoever wishes to be greatest among you must be your servant." One of the fundamental tenets of Christianity is individual responsibility: it may be said to be the corner-stone of Protestantism. Here is a principle to which we need to return again and again.

Athens, Ohio.

ARTICLE II.

THE MODERN CHURCH AND THE SOCIAL CRISIS.

BY EDWIN HEYL DELK, D.D.

There has always been a Church. There has always been a social order. The Church and the age have always acted and reacted on each other. I use the word church in the broadest sense. Wherever men, moved by the religious instinct, worshipped God in some organized way—pre-eminently in Hebrew and Christian forms of belief and cults—there we have a Church. In apposition to the Church we always find a social order with its domestic, industrial, political and moral status in which the Church lives and moves and which she affects for good or ill.

Sometimes the Church has been coterminous and identical with the social order about it. In a word, there have been times when we might say the State is the Church or the Church is the State. Such was ancient Israel's constitution and such was modern Russia up to the creation of the Duma.

Sometimes the Church is isolated and in intense antagonism to the age in which it exists. Such was the situation in the first two Christian centuries. Roman licentiousness and Augustan imperialism made any alliance and identification of the nascent Church with the State impious. The dream of a national Church was possible only as the Roman Empire became Christian in profession and socially regenerate.

The normal relation of the Church to the age is that of a moral and religious dynamic leading and transforming the social organism and spirit. Unfortunately the Church has not always been pure and disinterested in her life and attitude. Instead of strenuously seeking to redeem society, the Church, in certain ages, has been busy enriching a few of her eminent ecclesiastics, contending for temporal jurisdiction and destroying freedom of religious thinking by faggot and excommunication..

If a pure Church were the only factor at work the world would soon become the kingdom of God, but there are other factors at work more or less selfish and sensuous in principle against which

the Church has to contend and which she must transform in spirit before we dare look for social peace and righteousness. We have first of all the domestic, industrial, political and religious institutions, bequeathed from pagan and semi-barbarious times. Social customs and commercial practices which are antipodal in spirit to Christianity still confront the Church and challenge her to vindicate her claim to sanity and superiority of idea and ideal. There is a body of modern philosophy and forms of education which are frankly Positivistic in principle, or Agnostic as regards all religious belief. In the face of opposing social conditions, the Church has done fairly well in the redemption of society.

It is true that every age is a transitional period in history. But we are face to face today, in our own country, with more than a transition, we are face to face with a national crisis. To sum up the situation in a line I would say that it is the death grapple between the commercial spirit and the spirit of Christianity. Never have wealth and luxury on the one hand and rectitude and brotherhood on the other been so much in evidence. The battle in its industrial phase is between capitalism and the proletariat, but in its deepest antagonism it is between God and Mammon. The Church is supposed to stand for the worth of man rather than the worth of material greatness. It is a time for a thorough heart-searching on the part of the Church and a clear understanding of her duty in the present social crisis.

First let us consider some of the distinctive features of our age. Modern industrial organization has called forth one of the Church's most difficult problems. There was a time when master and man worked side by side at the same bench, in the same shop. The apprentice was a member of the household. A few tools owned by the workman himself were quite sufficient to make the simple implements of the farm and household. The spinning wheel, or hand-loom, in the house of every middle class householder made possible the industrial independence of most families. The village blacksmith, miller and butcher, provided for the material wants, and furnished food stuffs for the isolated hamlet. But all this simple industrial form of living was changed by the introduction of machinery. Few men were able to purchase the machine which made ten yards of cloth in a day

while the hand-loom produced but one. Only the well-to-do man could erect a building and install machines which could turn out five hundred pairs of shoes an hour while the same twenty-five workmen with hands alone could make but one hundred pairs in twelve hours. Men now had to seek work where they could find the machinery. The machine, or rather the owners of the machine, were the directing factors in the labor-world. The wages and the condition of labor were determined by the factory owners. Gradually certain centers of milling, of cutlery, of woolens, of shoemaking, of textile manufacture, were established, and the agricultural areas were drained of their most energetic blood. The cities, with their tall factory chimneys and congested populations seeking work, became the mart of human labor. The individual laborer stood no chance in bargaining for a wage. He took what he could get or was turned from the factory to secure the occasional job or to enter the ranks of the unemployed. Then came the rise of trades-unionism. There was a bitter struggle for its establishment. It was called harsh names and treated as a crime. The movement was fought by capitalist and every social conservative who saw in the rise and organization of the artizan class the appearance of an industrial force and political power which would endanger the vested privileges of manufacturers and landed proprietors.

In order to control trade, the separate manufacturers formed corporations, and these corporations were finally merged into common trusts which limited the output of the pooled factories and practically dictated the prices and policies of individual operators. The merging of various railroads into a few vast systems, and the corporate ownership of our coal fields and their alliance with certain of the great industrial trusts absolutely determined the sale and price of the common necessities of life. In order to secure this vantage ground, individual manufacturers and independent operators were either absorbed in the trust or crushed out of existence. Granted that the price of some staple commodities was not made excessive, and that some of the wealthy individual corporations have been able to continue to fight for their existence and portion of trade, the general fact stands, beyond contradiction, that the prices of the necessities of life have been controlled and steadily advanced artificially,

within the last twenty years, so that the great middle class and the poor of our great cities are not in position to purchase what they need of food stuffs, fuel and clothing. The vast communal tracts of land once available for distribution under the Homestead Laws have been practically exhausted. Every year the acquiring of land, which is the basal economic source of national wealth, by the native born and the thousands of immigrants seeking a foothold in America, grows more difficult. The small farm is gradually superseded by the large farm and huge tracts of land along our great lakes and rivers are being purchased by men of wealth for the creation of estates and game preserves, or for vast agricultural plants. It is prophesied by disinterested economists who have studied our American rural problem that we are rapidly reproducing the European condition, such as we find especially in Germany and England, i. e., the three groups of landed proprietors, tenant farmers and agricultural laborers. This class division is a menace to social and political equality which has been the characteristic and beneficent foundation of our American industry and life. What is going on in the rural sections finds its counterpart in our great cities. The value of real estate in the centers of population is subject to what our economists call the "unearned increment." That is, without any improvement of a residence, store or hotel, the price of a building or even a vacant lot may be doubled in value simply by the increase of surrounding population. The demand for certain locations in the center of residence and trade, the growth of a population needing houses and transportation, increase the value of property irrespective of improvements or any act of the owners of such vacant lots. The poorer people become congested in the undesirable portions of such cities and the middle class are forced to the outskirts of the metropolis. Car fares must be paid which swell the treasuries of transit companies who have secured long-term franchises at ridiculously low figures and often fail to furnish proper facilities for transportation and safety to the baffled public. In many of our states the chief railroad controls the legislature just as in our cities the trolley monopoly is in secret alliance with the political boss and influential councilmen. This situation has made possible here and there groups of financial pirates who prey upon the ignorance of the

public. Trustful men and helpless widows place their hard earned savings in insurance companies whose officers instead of protecting and increasing their clients' interests engage in financial ventures with trust funds, direct the policies of great banking institutions, draw enormous salaries, and float inflated blocks of so-called "Industrials" which often collapse and render penniless the insured and befooled investors. President Roosevelt has denominated the results of this kind of financiering "predatory wealth"—a heatless wealth which demands and secures rebates from railroads and threatens congressmen and legislators with political death unless they acquiesce in the demand of such piracy. We are grateful that a few intrepid statesmen are awake to the situation, and that our far-sighted and brave President is ready to lead in this crusade for the control of the directories of our great railroad systems, merciless groups of coal barons and meat packers. The result of this rapid concentration of wealth real and fictitious, has been the creation of exasperating luxury on the one hand and a bitter fight for higher wages and decent living on the other. A recent writer in the *Atlantic Monthly* tells of a society dame who built upon her summer estate at Newport, for one evening's entertainment, a pavilion which together with its decorations cost \$40,000. The whole affair was dismantled and demolished the following day. In contrast, on a nearby promitory, the villagers of a Portugese settlement battled on a wrecked steamer for fire wood for the coming winter. The old-time plea that the \$40,000 spent upon the pavillion went in wages to architect, carpenters, masons, upholsters and florists, is no longer an economic justification for such barbaric personal luxury. The same amount might have built twenty worthy homes for the fisher folk at easy rental. It is this flaunting of senseless extravagance and barbaric luxury in the faces of thousands of men and women out of work, which has bred the hatred and anarchistic spirit in the hearts of our day-laborers. Our poor may not be growing poorer, but our rich are certainly growing richer, which just as surely creates the social differences between the two classes. Mr. Charles Spahr in his *Distribution of Wealth in the United States*, says: "One per cent. of the families in our country hold more than half of the aggregate wealth of the country, more than all the rest of the na-

tion put together. Seven-eighths of the families hold only one-eighth of the national wealth." If we want approximate political equality, we must have approximate economic equality.

It is useless to claim that the so-called laboring classes receive the full reward of their productive value. For instance, the report of the Inter State Commerce Commission of June, 1902, states that from 1896-1902, the average wages and salaries of the railway employees of our country—1,200,000 men—had increased from \$550 to \$580, or five per cent. During the same period the net earnings of the owners had increased from \$377,000,000 to \$610,000,000 or sixty-two per cent. Or take industry in the mass the census of 1900 estimated the average per capita production at \$12-14 per day, and the average wage at \$1.38. Making all allowance for the monied value of the shrewd brains that plan and the wills that direct manual labor to its greatest productive power, the share of labor's reward is far from just and sufficient.

But it is the physical, intellectual and moral result of our present, social organization which forms the greatest indictment against the indifference and selfishness of those who seek to prevent reform in our industrial and commercial practices. Our periods of prosperity, too often based on wild speculation, periodically collapse and leave millions out of work. The men of middle and old age go down first because they cannot keep up the speed of the machines they work. The self-respecting workingman must then offer his body and brain to any employer who has an occasional job. His family is easily pushed over the line which separates honest poverty from pauperism. He grows desperate in his search for work. His small savings are soon exhausted and he either lives upon the labor of his children or in sheer desperation resorts to suicide. The young are able to face the battle perhaps until better times appear, but even they, on part-time, drift to the street corners and saloons, the girls become the prey of moral vultures and the children play in streets and alleys which reek with disease and moral filth. The physical, intellectual and moral degeneracy of sections of our city life is the darkest blot on our modern civilization.

Our economic policy has been individualism or rather a covert egoism which is nothing but selfishness. In the realms of the

family, the school and the Church a communistic spirit is normal and operative, but the moment men have entered the realms of factory, store, and stock exchange, the seemingly innocent maxim, "competition is the life of trade," which roughly translated, is really, "each man for himself and the devil take the hindmost," is almost unconsciously adopted as the principle of industrial and commercial life. This is surely not the best basis for social and industrial justice. Splendid as has been the general advance in the conditions of living made by the artizan class there are always groups outside the ranks of organized labor whose work is just as hard and just as poorly compensated as it was forty years ago. As regards the conditions of labor, in many cases, the situation is worse today than one hundred years ago. The hard and often bitter fight for work, the miserable wages paid, the crowded tenements, which make modesty and virtue often impossible, the resort to drink to dull the world-weary life, the vulgar shows of low vaudeville theatres, the easy positions given to women, in certain stores, for considerations which compromise chastity, all attest that, however encouraging may be the financial and social future for a large class of our working people, the situation as a whole is distressing, and calls for something more than mere reform. In the upper and middle classes of our land there has crept in the moral poison of divorce and a hedonistic philosophy of life which is creating a new paganism. Some of our literary men have given their sanction to the Nietzschean "Superman" who tramples under foot the ideas of Christian good and bad and makes for himself laws of personal conduct. True, only a small part of the people have sought to theoretically justify their pleasure passion by any philosophy ancient or modern, but the practical hedonism of large sections of society is only too apparent to any serious teacher of ethics or social reformer. Political reform can be accomplished when monetary interests are involved, but the public as a whole do not select or vote for the best available men for city and state officials. Democracy wishes the second best, but not the best men as her office holders. And as for the professional politicians of our cities, they choose men for us who are amenable to the mercenary party organization.

In the light of our general social condition, I do not wonder

that the working people and disinherited class even in our land of liberty and opportunity are slowly but surely turning towards Socialism as a remedy for our industrial inequality and unrest. And it is not only the ignorant and desperate classes who are urging and adopting Socialism as the only hope for social justice and peace. We find not only in English University circles, but also in our American centers of light and learning, warm-hearted, educated men and women who have cast their lot with the wage-worker to destroy the reign of capitalism and to declare for the abolition of private property and the general nationalizing of natural monopolies. There are all varieties of Socialism abroad in the land. It is a term difficult to define in the light of all the associations professing socialistic principles. Political democracy seemed to insure industrial democracy. The individualistic economy has broken down as a final solution of social questions. The disillusionment of the democratic enthusiast has taken place, and he turns to Socialism as the only remedy which will insure to the public the mineral wealth, the means of interstate transportation, the just distribution of food stuffs, manufactures, and the unearned increment upon land. In the midst of this Socialism of the parlor and labor union there are fiery anarchistic spirits who will not wait for gradual reform, but by radical legislation and revolution, if necessary, insist upon the immediate socialization of all the productive and distributive agencies of modern life. The Socialistic program is already before us, and woe be to us as leaders of public opinion, and to our political chiefs, if a careful study and practical consideration of the Socialistic demand is not made. The theory is no longer an idealistic philosophy of government, but has behind it a body of the people fiercely in earnest and intensely interested in the outcome of the social conflict. The press generally in the United States has not given accurate reports of the real size of the socialistic vote. Socialism has become the religion of thousands of men who have utterly repudiated the Church. Some items of its program have already been adopted in Germany and England. The nationalizing of telegraphs, telephones, railroads, certain manufactures, old age pensions and other schemes for social betterment, have become part of the organic law of these states. Many more numbers of the Socialistic program will be adopted,

but the true significance of this vast scheme of political and industrial reorganization cannot be realized until the ideas are actualized, and we stand face to face with its titanic control of the individual life. In our own land the Church has been the staunch defender of individualism, the divine right of private property in land, and frowned upon the radical socialist as an enemy of the marriage tie, personal ownership and religion. In reply the socialist has charged the Church with lack of interest in the struggle of the poor for better industrial conditions, misrepresentation of the motives and program of Socialism, and as being the ally of vested financial wrongs.

In the midst of this social unrest and political corruption what part has the Church played and what is her true relation to social betterment?

First in order of importance is a clear vision of the ultimate purpose of the Church. Is the Church an end in itself or a means to an end? Is her self-preservation and enrichment to be the first consideration? Is even winning men from sin and building them into the structure of the Church the ultimate end of her preaching and organization? In answering such a question we cannot stop with the answer of the theologian or ecclesiastic. The determinative answer to such an elemental question can be taken only from the pen of prophet and lips of Jesus himself. Only by a first hand reading of the Bible in its large purposes and final ideal of religion can we find the answer to our question.

In the Old Testament two great groups hold the center of thought—the human race and a particular people. The organic idea, not the personal idea, is the dominant note in the writing of the Hebrew historians and prophets. First is pictured the human apostacy and the promise of redemption, and then, when the great human group breaks up into tribes, come the Hebrew national apostacy and the promise of recovery. The dual motive of the whole historic tragedy is the moral and religious recovery of humanity through Israel. The sacrifices, the priesthood, the temple, the feasts, the laws, the prophecies of the Old Testament get their significance in the light of the hope of a restored Israel, a redeemed Israel to whom shall come the outstanding nations for salvation. Of course, the individuals who make up the nation are to be personally righteous, and must perform their re-

religious vows, but Jehovah's supreme demand of the individual is not for sacrifices and fastings but for those elemental virtues which men exercise in social life. In a word the prophets emphasized the need and demand for public morality. The later religious individualism appeared after Israel's political autonomy was destroyed by foreign conquerors. There is no contradiction, but rather a logical development, between social justice, truth, mercy, and brotherhood, and the growth in personal spirituality. What we need to constantly recall in this study is that when Israel was satisfied to rest in ceremony the prophets brushed aside sacrificial ritual altogether. "I desire goodness, not sacrifice," said Hosea, and Jesus was fond of quoting the words. Isaiah, when Israel turned to sacrifices and temple rites to appease the anger of Jehovah, in impassioned words spurned the method employed. He said, the herds of beasts trampling the Temple Court, the burning fat, the reek of blood, the clouds of incense, were a weariness and an abomination to the God they were meant to please. Their festivals and solemn meetings, their prayers and prostrations, were iniquity from which he averted his face. What He wanted was a right life and the righting of social wrongs. "Your hands are full of blood. Wash you! Make you clean! Put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes! Cease to do evil! Learn to do right! Seek justice! Relieve the oppressed! Secure justice for the orphaned and plead for the widow." The prophets were men dealing with public affairs, often they were statesmen advising kings upon just and honorable conduct of government. They were the champions of the poor. Professor Kautzsch says: "Since Amos it was the alpha and omega of prophetic preaching to insist on right and justice, to warn against the oppression of the poor and helpless." The edge of their investives was turned against the land-hunger of the landed aristocracy who joined house to house and field to field" till a country of sturdy peasants was turned into a series of great estates; against the capitalistic ruthlessness that "sold the righteous for silver and the needy for a pair of shoes;" thrusting the poor free-man into slavery to collect a trifling debt; against the venality of the judges who took bribes and had a double standard of law for the rich and poor."

Two things at least are made clear by these quotations. First,

that the religion which God demanded of Israel was ethical rather than ceremonial; and second, that the fruition of the righteous life is social and national peace, plenty, justice and mercy for all.

When we come to study the New Testament we naturally turn to the teaching of our Lord to determine the true aims of Christianity. Human nature is a pretty constant quantity, and we find only a few centuries after the establishment of the Christian faith an almost complete obscuration of its original interest. Priesthood, organization, sacrifices, ablutions, genuflections, bodily torture and spectacular ceremonies take the place of personal purity and public virtue as the supreme ends of religion.

It becomes, then, a vital matter for the Church in all ages to hold to the central aim of Jesus in life of His disciples and the purpose of the Church.

The age in which any man lives necessarily gives color and direction to all his thinking. Since the French Revolution, the social problem has been the growing and insistent problem before the people and their rulers. We must read the New Testament, today, in the light of the modern social changes going on about us, or we as Churchmen shall miss a splendid opportunity of moulding our age by the Christian principle. What then was, and is, the generic and central idea of Jesus? I take it that the ultimate goal of the Christian propaganda is "The Kingdom of God." All revelation, the Incarnation, the Atonement, personal salvation, Church and Sacraments, all moral discipline and rewards are given with this supreme end in view, i. e., that God's kingdom may come, and His will be done on earth as it is in heaven. The two notes of the kingdom are the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. In the First Century, especially in Jerusalem and Palestine, the Church was an organization bound together by these two controlling ideas. On the human side, it was distinctly communistic in its organization. The right of private property was not denied, but no man insisted upon his personal rights, but had all things in common. Further than this, "they sold their possessions and goods and parted them to all as every man had need." This practical expression of Christian brotherhood was the choicest fruitage of their faith and love. It was the test indeed of the sincerity and genuine-

ness of their loyalty to Christ's ideal of social life. The communism of the early Judeo-Christian Church must not be confounded with the politico-economic Communism proposed by Robert Owen, or his modern disciples. One was the spontaneous expression of a religious brotherhood inspired by the common love of our Lord, the latter was a political proposal based on compulsory legislation. The New Testament nowhere condemns the right of private property in land and things, but on the other hand the failure to see and feel the communistic spirit which lies at the center of the Church's life is to miss the dominant characteristic of early Christianity. The "kingdom of God" first exists in the heart of individual men, but it quickly emerges in action and expresses itself in economic and social mutuality of interest and life. Why then did the Church so quickly lose this primary aim of Jesus and the Apostles?

At the moment of the emergence of the Church from the Judean atmosphere she came in contact with Greek thought and Roman organization. The person of Christ, not on His historical, but on His metaphysical side, soon became the commanding concern of the Church. The intellectual battle was soon on. All the subtlety of Greek thought was engaged in the conflict upon the problem of the nature of Jesus and His relation to God and the Holy Spirit. For over a hundred years the bitter theological fight went on. Arianism found its chief antagonist in Athanasius. The intellect and much of the heart of the Church found its chief energy directed in the fight for what was orthodoxy. The Trinitarian controversy was followed by the Pelagian controversy and a score of other metaphysical and psychological battles, until finally, the great body of Christian belief was beaten out into systematized creeds called oecumenical. In the meantime the idea of the Church being the nucleus of the Kingdom of God almost perished, so that, Augustine's *City of God* was but the vision of a heavenly city descending to earth, not earth transformed in civic righteousness, joy and peace in the Holy Ghost.

In the Church's contact with Roman life and organization another blow was dealt to the generic idea of Christianity. Roman imperialism was in absolute contradiction to the democratic note of Jesus. But, as the Church has always taken color from the

national organization in which it is planted, so the simple note of equality and brotherhood of the Judean Church was soon lost in the elaborately graded system of the Roman hierarchy. The battle between local leaders and Roman bishops was fought to a finish. Slowly but surely the organization of secular Rome became the form for the organization of the Church in Rome. The Pontefex Maximus became the Papa or Pope. The splendid magisterial organization of the cities of the Empire, decided the diocesan organization of the triumphant Church. Men were busy in establishing the Eternal Church upon the ruins of the Eternal City. Once more, in the process of the spiritual and temporal conquest of Italy and the outlying colonies for Christ, His true purpose was lost sight of in enthroning and enlarging the Church herself. Sacerdotalism not the Christian socialization of humanity claimed the major part of the Church's time and thought.

Then came the long period of lethargy, and the romantic awakening of the Crusades. Feudalism rose like a mighty barrier to true brotherhood. The Mohammedan conquests awoke Christian Europe to a splendid militant but futile endeavor to reconquer the tomb and land of Christ. The romantic expeditions brought back the knowledge of pagan culture and art. The wealth of the Church and the new commerce with the Orient made possible the Renaissance. Now beauty and luxury filled the hearts of Kings and Popes alike. The common people and the peasantry were an after-thought. So once more the democratic communistic note of the early Church suffered a rebuff and was entombed in gorgeous ritual, and the literary glory of Italian and French authorship. Luxury was followed by corruption and corruption by the Reformation. Once during that period appeared the Peasants' Revolt, but it was quickly quashed in the more important contest for religious freedom. Then followed the deadening period of Protestant dogmatic controversy. Harshness of epithet and bitter factions marked the progress of the controversy. Scholastic formulae were galvanized into life and the whole strength, if not attention, of the Protestant Church, was given to proving the unprovable and setting up of confessional standards practically on a par with the Word of God itself. No wonder that in this wordy fray the center of

faith was shifted from life to thought, from brotherhood to confessionalism. In later days, when a genuine Piteism found voice in the life of the Church, there came the rebirth of the missionary movement in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries. This, in its inception, was dominated by the idea of personal salvation, the escape from individual sin, a saving from eternal destruction and the securing of a heavenly home. The Sociological idea had not yet entered into the missionary propaganda. The idea was to save heathen men not to transform India or China into a Christian brotherhood. Glorious was the heroism and splendid as was the martyrdom of those who first went out from Germany, England, Scotland and the United States, the full significance of the missionary movement was not realized until today. Missions and social progress are now clearly seen to be one and inseparable. Every activity and relation of man to man is to be transformed by the preaching of the Law and Gospel. A world-wide federation of Christian states is now the vision created by the missionary propaganda. The re-emergence of the primal Christian ideal is now beyond recall.

Nearly contemporaneous with the pietistic and missionary movements sprang up the great revivals, but once more the organic, ethical note in religion was overshadowed by that of personal salvation. The evangelist sought to save the individual sinner. The call was to escape from this present, evil world, and lead the peculiar aloof life of the saint. The center of vision was the tortured, repentant soul passing into the light of personal joy and peace. The world was irredeemably sunk in sin and the way of escape was to flee from the City of Destruction to the Delectable Mountain. There is no doubt that many branches of the Church were open to the charge of preaching otherworldliness rather than the duty and joy of redeeming society and establishing the Kingdom of God here and now. There will always be the need of Evangelism, personal evangelism, but the era of the great, organized revival having in view the salvation of the individual sinner exclusively is a thing of the past. The new Evangelism has a larger program and a truer ideal of the nature and purpose of religion.

Whatever may have been the need and justification, in the past, for the consuming and often bitter contention about dogma,

forms of Church government, ritual, religious experience and methods of evangelism, today, one who lays the stress of his work upon the past history of the Church has missed the mark. To-day the Church stands face to face with the great body of the artizan class estranged from organized Christianity. A vast sea of poverty and crime moves restlessly and threateningly about the Church. Some of the most hated members of the gigantic corporations sit in her pews and give color to the type of sermons preached. Many of her individual members are unconscious, or indifferent participants in corporate injustice. A calculated or uncalculated selfishness permits many of our great civic and religious benefactions to languish. Here and there some noble, rich man realizes his stewardship, but the vast body of our American wealth is still unconsecrated to God. The vision of the one family in Jesus Christ has nearly perished in many congregations. The world-idea of the Kingdom of God seems a utopian dream to the so-called practical man. What then is the duty of the Church in this social crisis?

First of all, to declare afresh and with all her might and main the need of love as the basal power in the regeneration of society. Socialism may or may not be the ultimate form for the expression of this economic and ethical brotherhood. Personally I am inclined to think that a genuine democracy, once Christianized, will own and control many of the industrial enterprises now owned and directed by private and corporate wealth. But Socialism no more than imperialism, or capitalism, can honestly and effectively conduct the affairs of government and trade, unless controlled by the supreme law of love. "Love" here, as in the personal religious life, "is the fulfilling of the law."

The spirit of love must find expression in a closer identification of the Church with the movements for the betterment of civic and industrial conditions. The political and social atmosphere reacts upon the individual religious life. We must seek to save the social structure *and* the individual sinner. The Presbyterian Church has set our American Churches a splendid example in this respect. Not only do we find the discussions of social problems going on in her great general bodies; she has also appointed one, or more, special representatives of her body to carry her greetings to the labor unions. In a number of cities

delegates from that Church sit in the labor unions, and members of the union appear in the public discussions of her ecclesiastical gatherings. Under her leadership the tide has begun to turn, and organized labor has given a willing ear to the message of the Gospel. Misunderstandings and alienations have been corrected and healed. Once more the hope and belief that the Gospel is for rich and poor has been established in the hearts of a section of the artizan class. But it is only a beginning. The Social Democracy of Germany and the militant Socialism of the United States deny that religion forms any part of the party programs. They propose to make their fight without any form of religion. We who know how utterly futile any political and moral regeneration is without righteousness and love, must identify the Church more fully with the cause of the poor and disinherited class. The interests of the Church are intimately linked with the life of the common people. The common people, once truly educated, will be the power of the future. On grounds of expediency, as well as privilege, the Church must seek to win and bless the rising throng of the industrial world. In Europe, the Church and governments stand out against the socialistic movement. In the United States the breach is not near so great between the Church and labor. Any and every specific moral wrong done the working class must be a point of attack and rectification by the Church. Here, in Pennsylvania, there are thousands of children engaged in enervating labor. The cupidity of parents and the indifference of employers should be rebuked and the laws against child labor enforced. The drink evil which wrecks so many individual lives and homes should be controlled; if possible, the saloon should be eliminated. The tenement houses which wreck the health and morals of thousands should be reconstructed on sanitary and ethical plans. The fact that one marriage in every twelve in the United States ends in divorce, should arouse the whole Church to the shame and disaster which such animalism must engender in our social life. The movements for the protection and rightful support of girlhood and old age should enlist the head and heart and purse of every true Christian. To brighten the existence and gladden the heart of the countless throng of poor children of our congested centers of city life, to shame the selfish rich and sup-

port every sane and honest attempt to increase the wage and secure the blessings of education, culture and moral cleanliness for all men are some of the glorious opportunities for service now offered the Church of Christ.

As we use that phrase—The Church of Christ—our voice grows less confident, for that institution as conceived by Jesus and as planted by His apostles has been dismembered by later ages and no longer is prepared to act as a unit. Never before, however, since the First Century, has the burden and problem of the age made the call to federal action on the part of the Church so easy or so logical. The social problem is the Church's problem as never before. Her internal problems are at rest, or at least secondary to the outward and perplexing call to redeem society. I do not plead for the repudiation of any distinctive denominational note in theology or cultus, but I do plead for a federation for social and moral service without which I see no hope of realizing the Kingdom of God. The internal contentions and assumptions of religious legitimacy which have barred co-operative effort are not of Christ, but of human arrogance and the Devil. We dare not forget the prayer of our Master "That they may be one as thou Father and I am one." It is a unity of life, not identity of individuality, of thought, or form which constitutes spiritual oneness. The things we sacrifice in order to enter into federated social service are not the things which God counts great.

This movement for a truer realization of the Kingdom of God here and now, is a work committed to the whole Church, not to the preachers and pastors alone. Church councils, vestries, brotherhoods, leaders of every name and form must be aroused and forced into activity in this cause of Christian brotherhood. There are millions of Churchmen who are heinous sinners in this cause. They may be respectable, nominal Christians, they may be zealous for this or that form of Church government, they may be vociferously loyal to their denominational history and achievements, they may be counted sturdy pillars of local support and in Sunday School work, but their contribution towards the present day propaganda for social righteousness may be pitifully small. The priest or minister is not the sole voice of the Church. The individual and the collective membership of the

Church must voice this great purpose and ideal of Christ. Too often the associations and operations of the Church have in view merely the spiritual culture of her own membership, or the enlarging of her numerical strength and prestige. Not until the larger vision of Christ becomes the ideal and possession of the whole Church dare we look for that consideration and honor which may be once more given her by the world.

In this hour of opportunity and crisis, let all men having the mind of Christ, cast in their lot in the great causes of industrial justice, social betterment, political reform, commercial integrity and Christian brotherhood. Let the law of love which places duties above rights, manhood above dividends, purity above power, chastity above pleasure, commonweal above wealth, contentment above class privilege, love above commercialism, reign in our hearts, our homes, our factories, our boards of trade, our senates and industrial life forevermore.

Philadelphia, Pa.

ARTICLE III.

THE BIRTH AND CHILDHOOD OF JESUS.

BY REV. WILLIAM WEBER, PH.D.

In offering this essay to the readers of *THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY*, I have to guard at the very outset against possible misunderstandings. It is not an original paper I have written, but a review of statements and assertions made by others. It is not my purpose to endorse, advocate, and propagate their opinions. I only desire to report correctly some lately proposed solutions of the serious problem of the nativity of our Lord.

One might say, perhaps, these solutions are so radical that they threaten to undermine the very foundation of our Christian faith. Therefore we should beware not to aid and abet the enemy by bringing his destructive ideas to the notice of the general public. My answer is they are already before the public. Moreover, I do not imagine that many laymen, if any, will read this paper. It would be tough reading for them. It requires an amount of theological knowledge and interest which as a rule only trained theologians acquire and possess. I am writing exclusively for our pastors. They certainly have sufficient judgment to distinguish between truth and error. It is, at the same time, their sacred duty to watch what is going on in theology. They must be familiar with the more important exegetical information that is being published constantly. The Bible and knowledge about the Bible and its contents quite necessarily stand in the center of a Lutheran minister's attention.

Our faith is ruthlessly assailed. Unless we prove a thorough mastery of the Word of God, our chiefest, if not only, weapon, our own church members will lose confidence in our guidance. The other day, I read Björnson's *In God's Ways*. The author is the son of a Lutheran minister. He arraigns our Church in a terrible manner. Ole Tuft, the representative of the clergy, knows nothing but the dogmas of the Church. His friends and companions smile at his ignorance. He is accused by his own wife of teaching and preaching things he does not believe in.

himself. He and his followers are entirely wanting in charity. Though highly respectable, they are murderers, driving people to death by their narrow-mindedness and heartlessness. On the other hand, the hero, placed in opposition to the pastor, is an infidel, a physician, who finally compels the minister to recognize in him the better man, the one that walks in God's ways.

Such a book is a warning for all ministers. We need not accept the author's judgment as entirely true. But it shows us where we may fail in our ministry. We have to deal with all sorts and conditions of men, and we must deserve the respect of all of them. As preaching forms so great a part of our duties, we are largely dependent on the judgment of intellectually wide-awake people, even outside the Church. In order to hold our own with them, we must have a more thorough and comprehensive knowledge of our religion and all the problems connected with it than any former generation of ministers.

Of course, nobody can expect and demand us to be up-to-date astronomers, geologists, biologists, chemists, etc. But there is no religious and theological problem with which we ought not to be acquainted in all its ancient and modern phases. A non-theologian must not be given any chance of exposing us as ignoramuses in our own profession, as Ole Tuft was humbled by a medical student. He rendered himself pitifully ridiculous, not because he refused to accept the Biblical account of Samson as a sun-myth, but because he, the Bible student, had never heard of that theory nor of any other theory by which those stories may be and have been explained.

To add my insignificant mite to the theological, as strictly distinguished from the religious, knowledge of the readers of THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY is the task I proposed to myself. What I have to communicate may look very insignificant and irrelevant to them. Still, as long as it increases, however slightly, their acquaintance with modern theological problems, it has obtained its end.

In the first place, I wish to call attention to an article, entitled *Nativity*, in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica* of 1901. This article is from the pen of the late Professor H. Usener of Bonn. Professor Usener was not a theologian, but a classical philologist, who took great interest in New Testament questions. He ex-

amines the first two chapters of St. Matthew and St. Luke and arrives at the following conclusions:

Mt. I. 18, II. 23, forms a unity. According to that account, Jesus is the son of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary. "When Mary had been betrothed to Joseph, before they came together she was found with child of the Holy Ghost." (Mt. I. 18.) "That which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost." (Mt. I. 20.) To leave no room for doubt, we learn that Joseph, when becoming aware of Mary's condition, intended to put her away privily. The law was that such a betrothed girl should be stoned to death either in front of her father's house-door or, if her father were dead, before the city-gate. But even after he had become reconciled to the pregnancy of Mary and married her, he refrained from sexual intercourse till after the birth of Jesus. (Mt. I. 25.) The author of the narrative explains the supernatural conception and birth of Jesus as the fulfillment of the prophecy, found Is. VII. 14.

The birthplace of Jesus is Bethlehem. "Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judea." (Mt. II. 1.) That likewise had been foretold by one of the prophets, (Mi. V. 1), and the chief priests and scribes of the people at Jerusalem were so well aware of the fact that the coming King of the Jews, the Messiah, was to see the light of this world in the old city of David that they hesitated not a moment when asked about Christ's birthplace. (Mt. II. 4 f.)

Bethlehem appears, however, as the permanent home of Joseph and Mary up to the time when they fled into Egypt. For Jesus seems to have been about two years old when the wise men from the east arrived and worshipped him. They had seen His star in the east. That star, of course, began to shine the same moment Jesus was born. The wise men observed it, recognized its significance, and set out to pay homage to the new King. Herod, after directing them to Bethlehem, "learned of them carefully what time the star appeared." (Mt. II. 7.) He afterwards, in order to remove the Messiah, "slew all the male children that were in Bethlehem and in all the borders thereof, from two years old and under, according to the time which he had carefully learned of the wise men." (Mt. II. 16.) The star therefore must have become first visible about two years before

the visit of the wise men. That implies that Jesus was then about two years old. His parents are evidently residents of Bethlehem; they have a house there. The wise men "came into the house and saw the young child with Mary, His mother." (Mt. II. 11.)

Nazareth, the Galilean home of Jesus, is not mentioned till after the return of the holy family from Egypt. They apparently would have settled again at Bethlehem if it had not been for the son and successor of Herod. For we read of Joseph, "he came into the land of Israel. But when he heard that Archelaus was reigning over Judea in the room of his father Herod, he was afraid to go thither." (Mt. II. 21 f.) He then was told in a dream to go to Nazareth in order that another prophecy "he shall be called Nazarene," should be fulfilled. (Mt. II. 23.)

The Holy Ghost, not Joseph, is according to Mt. I. 18-25, the father of Jesus. Hence, Jesus can not be called the "Son of David." For the genealogy (Mt. I. 1-17), proves only Joseph to be a lineal descendant of the great king whose son was to be the Christ. Even if Mary should have been a member of the old royal family, Jesus could not be called a son of David because patriarchy, not matriarchy, prevailed in Israel. The child belonged to his father's, not his mother's, family. Besides, the only New Testament information about the descent of Mary we possess makes of her a member of the tribe of Levi. The angel of the annunciation tells Mary: "Behold Elizabeth thy kinswoman, she also has conceived a son." (Lk. I. 36.) Elizabeth, however, is called a daughter of Aaron. (Lk. I. 5.)

At this point, Usener has his first criticism to offer. He claims that elsewhere in the Gospels Jesus appears as the son of Joseph without any qualification, correction, or reservation. He quotes in support of this view the question of the people of Nazareth: "Is not this Joseph's son?" (Lk. IV. 22.) Matthew himself vouches for the version: "Is not this the carpenter's son?" (Mt. XIII. 55.) He calls our attention to what Philip says to Nathaniel: "We have found him of whom Moses in the law and the prophets did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph." (Jn. I. 45.) These passages demonstrate, in Usener's estimation, that during his public ministry Jesus was known simply as the son of Joseph. Neither He nor His dis-

ciples protested against that assumption. Neither Philip nor Nathaniel found the fatherhood of Joseph in any way incompatible with the divine sonship of Jesus. For although just told that Jesus was the son of Joseph, Nathaniel greets him with the words: "Rabbi, thou art the Son of God." (Jn. I. 49.)

Usener, moreover, appeals to the authority of St. Paul, who declares that Jesus was "born of the seed of David according to the flesh, declared Son of God, with power according to the spirit of holiness by the resurrection of the dead." (Rom. I. 3-4.) Jesus can have been born of the seed of David only if he was the true son of Joseph. For through him alone he could trace his descent back to the great king. (cf. Heb. VII. 14.)

Usener finally calls upon the genealogy (Mt. I 1-17, cf. Lk. III. 23-38) to uphold his contention. For it could have no possible meaning, no right to appear as part of the Gospel unless it stated originally that Jesus was descended from David through his father Joseph. Accordingly, the words, "the husband of Mary" must be omitted and the Greek relative pronoun for "of whom" be changed from the feminine to the masculine form in v. 17. That addition and change were introduced in order to bring the genealogy into some kind of apparent harmony with the immediately following narrative.

But Usener goes still farther. Taking up the virgin-birth, he tells us that the Hebrew text of Is. VII. 14 does not speak of a "virgin" giving birth to a son, but that the Greek translator of the LXX. whom Mt. I. 23, quotes, made a serious mistake in rendering the Hebrew word by *παρθενος*. The original text speaks of an *עלמה*. That means a marriageable young woman. Gesenius explains: "The word designs a young woman merely as having reached the stage of puberty, not as untouched virgin, for whom the Hebrew has a different name *בתולה*." In this connection also the saying of St. Paul is cited: "When the fulness of the time came, God sent forth His Son, born of a woman, born under the law." (Gal. IV. 4.) The Greek word for woman, used by the apostle, is *γυνή*. That, as any Greek dictionary will show, means (1) woman as opposed to man, (2) wife, or married woman as opposed to *παρθενος*, (3) the female mate of ani-

mals. St. Paul clearly avoids the characteristic term *παρθενος* upon which the virgin-birth of Jesus rests.

Usener finally states that the whole birth and childhood-story of Matthew is based in every detail upon a pagan substratum. Mt. I 18, II 23, has been contributed to the history of Jesus by a Gentile—not a Jewish-Christian. The idea of the Holy Ghost begetting a child with a human mother is in perfect harmony with what the Greeks told and believed about the conception and birth of their heroes. But the same idea is altogether repulsive to the Hebrew mind. Usener, probably for want of space, refrains from proving the latter half of that statement. But it admits of hardly any doubt.

Wünsche (*Beiträge zur Erläuterung der Evangelien aus Talmud und Midrasch*) remarks with reference to Mt. I. 18: "Even if Talmud and Midrasch say in diverse passages of the Messiah that He is to come from another place, that does not refer, at all, as the context teaches, to a supernatural or unnatural, but only to a foreign origin, that is, the Messiah will owe His life not to an Israelitish but to a Moabitish woman. Though Jewish legends attempt to glorify the death of their heroes, as f. inst., that of Moses by apparations of angels, they never have enveloped their origin in such a supernatural garment and represented them as the product of an immediate cohabitation of the Holy Ghost."

According to the Book of Enoch, sexual intercourse between celestial and terrestrial beings is the gravest and most fearful of all sins that can be imagined. That apocryphal writing treats copiously of the fall of the angels. The sin they committed and for which they suffer eternal punishment consisted in their marrying daughters of the sons of men. The Book of Enoch is no longer very highly esteemed as a source of religious information. Nevertheless, it is expressly mentioned in the New Testament, and it is generally admitted to have exercised a powerful influence upon all New Testament writings without exception. Charles, the English translator of the book, enumerates not less than ninety New Testament passages that have their older parallels in Enoch. His list is by no means complete. Tertullian already tells us that St. Paul refers in I. Cor. XI. 1-16, to the Book of Enoch. He warns the Christian women not to appear

with uncovered heads at the divine services of the congregation in order not to tempt the angels to fall likewise into that terrible sin of Gen. VI. 1 ff., and Enoch VI-XXXVI.

Charles furthermore discusses the "doctrines of Enoch which had an undoubted share in moulding the corresponding New Testament doctrines, or are at all events necessary to the comprehension of the latter." These doctrines are (a) the nature of the Messianic kingdom and the future life, (b) the Messiah, (c) Sheol and the resurrection, (d) demonology. If therefore the Book of Enoch teaches us that marriages between heavenly beings and earth-born women are the most terrible thing that could happen, provoking God's undying wrath, if we remember the word of Jesus "in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels in heaven," we cannot lightly reject Usener's statement that the virgin-birth of Christ is a Gentile, not a Jewish, idea. We learn from church history that the original, primitive Christian Church in Palestine continued to exist till to the days of the Mohammedan conquest. Those old Jewish Christians regarded Jesus as the son of Joseph and Mary.

Usener does not attach any importance to the childhood-story in Matthew as a source of historical truth. He does not say so directly but it appears from his general remarks that he looks upon the star episode and the slaughter of the innocents rather as fairy tale elements.

Turning now to the account of the birth of Jesus in Luke, Usener admits, as in the case of Matthew, that the first two chapters are essentially a homogeneous whole. He calls them in distinction from Mt. I-II, the Jewish-Christian account of Christ's birth.

Jesus is born in Bethlehem in Judea. (Lk. II. 7.) In so far the two Gospels agree. But their agreement ends right here. Bethlehem is in Luke by no means the permanent home of Joseph and Mary. They happen to come there only by accident and stay but a short while. Caesar Augustus had decreed a universal census. That census was taken in Palestine apparently not after the Roman but after the Old Testament manner, founded on the tribal organization of the people of Israel. Everybody had to repair to the original home of his tribe and family.

Joseph resided at Nazareth in Galilee but, being a descendant of David, he had to report at Bethlehem. "Joseph went up from Galilee, out of the city of Nazareth, into Judea, to the city of David, because he was of the house and family of David to enrol himself with Mary." (Lk. II. 4 f.) They had no house in Bethlehem. They found not even room at the inn. (Lk. II. 7.)

Neither did they remain any longer than necessary in that inhospitable place. For "when the days of their purification according to the law of Moses were fulfilled, they brought him up to Jerusalem to present him to the Lord." (Lk. II. 22.) "And when they had accomplished all things that were according to the law of the Lord, they returned into Galilee, to their own city, Nazareth." (Lk. II. 39.) This law of the Lord is contained in Lev. XII. There it says clearly and unmistakably that a woman, bearing a male child, was unclean for forty days, and had, when the days of her purifying were fulfilled, to offer certain sacrifices at the door of the tent of the meeting, that is, at the temple of Jerusalem. It is therefore quite evident that the parents of Jesus stayed after his birth only for forty days at Bethlehem. They then went home immediately to Nazareth, their own city. These forty days leave, of course, no time for the events, narrated in Matthew as occurring between the birth of Jesus and his arrival in Nazareth. This discrepancy is so great as to exclude all attempts at harmonizing them. Either the one or the other is true, while it is not impossible that both may contain legendary matter.

But Usener has still more suggestions to offer. He reads in Lk. II. 5, instead of the received text *ὁν Μαριάμ τῇ ἐμνηστευμένῃ αὐτῷ* (with Mary who was betrothed to him), *ὁν Μαριάμ τῇ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ* (with Mary his wife). This reading is supported by the Syrian palimpsest of Sinai, discovered by Mrs. Agnes Lewis Smith. It is further attested by the pre-Hieronymian texts of Verona and Vercelli, which have *cum Maria uxore sua* and by the Colbertinus. The textual critics seem generally inclined to accept this reading as original. For it is easy enough to understand why this text should have been altered so as to form the received text which has been made to agree with Mt. I. 18. On the other hand, it is well nigh impossible to account for the opposite change. Moreover, the old reading is strongly sup-

ported by the context. Compare $\delta \pi \alpha \tau \eta \rho \alpha \upsilon \tau \omicron \upsilon \kappa \alpha \iota \eta \mu \eta \tau \eta \rho \alpha \upsilon \tau \omicron \upsilon$ (Lk. II. 33), $\omicron \iota \gamma \omicron \nu \epsilon \iota \varsigma \alpha \upsilon \tau \omicron \upsilon$ (Lk. II. 41, 43), and $\delta \pi \alpha \tau \eta \rho \sigma \omicron \upsilon \kappa \alpha \gamma \omega$ (Lk. II. 48).

Usener also adopts the results of the investigation of Joh. Hillmann with regard to the genuineness of Lk. I. 34 f. as conclusive. That scholar has undertaken to prove that the just mentioned verses are an interpolation. (ZPT. XVII. p. 221 ff.) I was unable to obtain a copy of that magazine and cannot report on the arguments by which Hillmann tries to demonstrate that opinion. I shall, however, have occasion to return to that passage later on.

Usener finally does not know what to make of the census in Lk. II. It is supposed that a census was conducted by Quirinius in the year 6-7 A. D. But Lk. III. 23 protests against so late a date of the birth of Jesus. Usener cannot admit that such a census was held in the days of Herod. He thus finds that in Lk. I. 5 and II. 1, Luke contradicts himself. Besides, the way in which the census is apparently conducted does not appeal to him as proper. The Roman census paid little attention to old tribal relations. For these reasons Usener thinks that in Lk. II. 1 ff. a person unfamiliar with Roman customs has attempted to bring the parents of Jesus to Bethlehem in order that their first-born son should enter the world in the city of His great forefather and so fulfill the prophecy of Micha. But that very attempt seems to prove to him that Jesus was not born at Bethlehem.

He accordingly sums up the result of his researches in the statement: "The oldest written forms of the Gospel knew, and knew only, that Jesus was born at Nazareth as the son of Joseph and Mary." He discovers a last corroboration of his view that Luke is a witness for the natural birth of Jesus in the oldest reading of the second half of Lk. II. 22. The codices teach us that the Greek Church down to about 300 A. D. and the Latin Church down to beyond 360 A. D. read here: "Thou art my son. This day have I begotten thee." The divine sonship of Jesus begins accordingly with his baptism. From the above quoted words of Paul in the beginning of his epistle to the Romans one might argue that it began with His resurrection.

These are the most prominent features of Professor Usener's position. His article must of course be studied in detail. It is

brimfull of the ripest scholarship. But in judging his arguments we must be careful not to reject them simply because they do not coincide with our own views and convictions. The late Prof. Usener was certainly not an enemy of the Christian religion. If there had been the slightest doubt on that part, his article would never have found a place in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*. He does not write as a theological partisan eager either to confirm or to disapprove certain dogmas. He is one of those impartial seekers after historical truth.

The difference between historical truth and religious truth is indeed great. The latter consists in convictions which must influence our conduct, cheer and comfort our hearts, and finally bring about the most intimate communion with God. Religious truth concerns our conscience and emotions. Historical truth as a part of scientific truth appeals to our intellect. To search after it requires intellectual training. Theology is a science whose object is religion. Theology as such is not identical with religion. It is not even necessary for religion. We may be truly religious without having the slightest idea of theology and without caring in the least about that science. Theology belongs to the intellectual outfit of a preacher and teacher of religion, but it makes him as little a better and truer Christian as his knowledge of Greek and Hebrew does.

That means such statements as those of Usener must be received and treated in the same spirit in which they are given. Whether we accept or reject them does not affect our religious status in the least. As convinced Christians we have nothing to do with such purely scientific questions. But as theologians, as teachers of the Christian religion we have to struggle most severely and earnestly with these and similar problems in order to discover, if possible, the real historical truth and nothing but that truth. The views presented to us by Usener are by no means to be taken as final and decisive. He never claimed infallibility. Moreover, in this case we shall see at once how far the question of Christ's nativity is from being settled when we come to what Prof. Fr. Spitta has to say about the same problem.

Friedrich Spitta is professor of theology at the University of Strassburg. He is the son of the well-known Lutheran pastor, the author of *Psalter and Harp*, Carl J. P. Spitta. He pub-

lished in 1906, several years after the appearance of the German original of Usener's article in the ZNTW, an essay entitled "Die chronologischen Notizen und Hymnen in Lc. 1 & 2" (The Chronological Notices and Hymns in Lk. I. & II.) in the same magazine. The first part of that paper takes up the problem of the nativity of Jesus where Usener left it.

In Usener's eyes, the statements "There was in the days of Herod, king of Judea, a certain priest" (Lk. I. 5) and "it came to pass in those days, there went out a decree from Caesar Augustus that all the world should be enrolled. This was the first enrollment made when Quirinius was governor of Syria." (Lk. II. 1-2) contradict each other. Spitta undertakes to demonstrate that they do not necessarily exclude one another. In order to be enabled to do that, he rejects the generally accepted theory that Mary conceived Jesus at the time when the angel called upon her. In other words, he does not read out of Lk. I. that Jesus was only six months younger than John the Baptist.

Spitta agrees with Usener as to the text of Lk. II. 5, "with Mary his wife who was pregnant," and of Lk. III. 22, "Thou art my son. This day have I begotten thee." He is convinced that, according to the oldest text of Luke, Jesus is the firstborn son of Joseph and Mary. Lk. I. 32-33 is in his estimation conclusive in that respect. For it is Joseph who belongs to the house of David. Of Mary's family nothing is said. The angel foretells her of her son: "The Lord God shall give him the throne of his father David; and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end." Only as son of Joseph had Jesus a right to the title Son of David.

Joseph and Mary were betrothed, not yet married, in the sixth month of Elizabeth's pregnancy. (Lk. I. 27.) The angel announces to her: "Thou shalt conceive in thy womb and bring forth a son." (I. 31.) That does not imply that the conception took place immediately. It refers rather to some future date, just as the words, "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee." (I. 35.) Lk. I. states nowhere that Mary was with child. Elizabeth's salutation: "Blessed art thou among women and blessed is the fruit of thy womb!" bears a proleptical and prophetic character.

"The fruit of thy womb" is of course Jesus. But as little as Jesus had been born at that time, as little need he already have been conceived. It is not strange that a virgin about to be married should be greeted in such a manner by an older woman in a country where childlessness was feared as a curse. The words, "Whence is this to me that the mother of my Lord should come to me?" are exactly on the same level. In a similar way, Adam calls Eve "the mother of all living" before even their first child was born. God says to Abraham: "A father of many nations have I made thee." (Rom. IV. 17, Gen. XVII. 5.)

The very fact of Mary's visit and stay with Elizabeth for about three months testifies against the supposition of her having been with child at that period. Elizabeth kept in seclusion during the first five months of her pregnancy. Why should Mary have publicly paraded her interesting state of health although she was not yet wedded to Joseph? For after her comparatively long abode with Elizabeth she "*returned unto her house,*" not unto the house of Joseph. (I. 56.) The length of her stay with her kinswoman shows that she assisted her in her household work. That however proves clearly that she had neither household duties of her own to perform nor that her bodily condition prevented her from working for others. That she left Elizabeth shortly before the birth of John points in the same direction. It would have been indelicate for an unmarried girl, not for a pregnant woman, to assist at the childbed.

A last argument in favor of this view that the annunciation of the birth of Jesus and his conception do not coincide. Spitta finds in Lk. II. 5: "To enroll himself with Mary, his wife, who was great with child." If the author of Lk. I-II. had been under the impression that Mary conceived Jesus when Gabriel came to her, he would not have stated that she was pregnant when she came to Bethlehem. His narrative is not characterized by useless repetitions.

Spitta is thereby enabled to assume a greater interval than six months between the birth of the Baptist and that of Jesus. For he finds that Mary was still in the state of singleness when John was born. The census of Lk. II. may therefore have been taken after the death of Herod.

Spitta thinks, however, that the idea of the supernatural con-

ception has induced the scholars to assume that annunciation and conception were contemporaneous. He thus turns to I. 33 ff. The first two of these verses have been challenged by Hillmann, whose reasons Usener regarded as conclusive. Spitta likewise deems these two verses spurious. They are out of tune with the tenor of the whole narrative. The announcing of the Baptist's birth to Zacharias and the annunciation are clearly parallels. The author intends to compare the two characters. The priest proves a doubting Thomas. "Whereby shall I know this? For I am an old man and my wife well stricken in years." (I. 18.) Gabriel receives this answer as a sinful want of trust in God. He scolds Zacharias severely and punishes him by striking him dumb. In comparison herewith, it looks queer that Mary, the humble handmaid of God, should have ventured to express the same doubt by saying: "How shall this be, seeing I know not man?" (I. 34.) It is still more inconceivable that the angel neither reproves nor punishes her for her unbelief. He rather explains to her the mysterious process of divine conception, a thing seemingly unbecoming in the case of a chaste and pure maiden. Moreover, she is shortly afterward highly praised for believing in the heavenly message. Elizabeth tells her: "And blessed is she that believed. For there shall be a fulfillment of the things which have been spoken to her from the Lord." (I. 45.) This praise seems quite undeserved in view of I. 34.

Another difficulty is presented by the words: "How shall this be, seeing that I know not a man?" Mary was at that time engaged to marry Joseph. Joseph was a son of David. A son of the union of Joseph and Mary might therefore indeed be "the son of David." The only doubtful feature was, not that Mary knew no man, but that Joseph was ranking so low on the social scale. For generations, his ancestors had been humble peasants. The question of Mary can thus have but one meaning. She had devoted herself to perpetual virginity. Joseph was to become her husband only in name. That is the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church. But it evidently does not fit into our context, and it is contradicted by all the other references to the family of Jesus contained in the New Testament. Such reflections in-

duce Spitta to agree with Hillman as to the spuriousness of I. 34-35.

But he goes another step beyond his predecessor and drops also I. 36-37. They form an integral part of the second speech of Gabriel, called forth by Mary's doubt. The information it conveys to Mary about Elizabeth's pregnancy is superfluous. The statement: "She hid herself five months saying, Thus has the Lord done unto me in the days wherein he looked upon me to take away my reproach among men" (I. 24 f.), implies that from the sixth month onward Elizabeth made known her condition and received the congratulations of her friends and relatives. It was therefore not at all necessary that Gabriel should bring the joyful tidings to Mary in the sixth month. By that time she had heard of it in all probability through their ordinary channels of communication.

Spitta finds a welcome confirmation of his views in the peculiar text preserved in Codex b. There the skeptical question of Mary (I. 34) does not occur. The words of I. 38, "Behold, I am the handmaid" etc., are joined immediately to I. 33. The second speech of Gabriel, I. 35-37, of our received text, follows after I. 38 without having been called forth by any remark of Mary whatever.

Attacking the problem presented by Lk. II. 1-4, Spitta accepts unconditionally the verdict of Schuerer: "A Roman census could under no circumstances be held in Palestine during the reign of King Herod. Josephus has no knowledge of a Roman census in Palestine during the life-time of Herod. A census taken by Quirinius could not fall into Herod's reign since Quirinius was not governor of Syria during the life-time of Herod." But Spitta does not understand the words *πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην* to refer to a census of the whole Roman Empire. He assumes with Wellhausen and Nestle an Aramaic source for the Lucan gospel. In trying to retranslate the Greek expression into Hebrew he finds the phrase *כל-הארץ*. The Hebrew word *הארץ* means the earth as opposed to heaven, it means, however, also a country like the land of Egypt, the land of Judah, etc. Spitta therefore thinks that the translator made a mistake and rendered by *πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην* what he ought to have rendered *πᾶσαν τὴν χώραν*, the whole country. That appears the more

plausible as the fact can easily be ascertained that even modern translators have frequently committed the same mistake in translating from the Hebrew, or from Hellenistic Greek into a modern language.

Spitta next proceeds to prove from Josephus that there has been taken a local census of Palestine in the year 4-3 B. C. after the death of King Herod. Augustus had to call for such a census. For the tributary kingdom of Herod was to be divided among his sons. The tribute to be paid by them had to be fixed. Since this belongs entirely to the field of secular history, it is not necessary to review here the argument of Spitta. Besides, it would occupy too much space.

I desire to call attention to one more interesting and important theory of Spitta. He accepts the statement of Luke that Joseph had to go to Bethlehem in order to be enrolled there although his permanent home was at Nazareth and that Jesus was consequently born in the city of his forefather David, as historical. The evangelist may not be quite correct in telling us that every inhabitant of Palestine had to report on that occasion at the original seat of his family. It may be also that the Romans in this case as in other cases adopted for reasons of expediency local customs and institutions. Palestine, at that period, was not yet an integral part of the Empire and was ruled according to its own laws. There is also another possibility. David may have owned some property at Bethlehem and, on that account, been compelled to enrol himself there. Schuerer quotes the Roman ordinance: "Is vero qui agrum in alia civitate habet in ea civitate profiteri debet in qua ager est; agri enim tributum in eam civitatem debet levare in cuius territorio possidetur. That Joseph, a scion of the house of David, should have held some property at Bethlehem cannot be regarded as entirely out of question. How could he have been known as a son of David if there had not been some such tangible tie as a piece of property binding him to Bethlehem and constantly reminding him and his neighbors of his royal descent?

Even Spitta's position may be very unsatisfactory in the judgment of many theologians. The conclusions at which Usener and Spitta arrived prove indeed that our modern Biblical scholars are still very far from having established the absolute truth.

Many important questions remain unanswered, and nothing is certain but that it is the duty of every pastor and theologian to go to work and assist in the search for satisfactory solutions.

But are we permitted to pay any attention to such teachers as Usener and Spitta? Do they not subvert the very foundations upon which our faith in Jesus Christ rests? We should not overlook that these scholars and their fellow-workers and competitors are guided alone by an ardent zeal to understand the true meaning of the Bible. They pay the closest attention to the word and letter of the Holy Scriptures and to everything adapted to throw any light upon them. The more highly we esteem the Word of God, the more we must imitate their example and adopt their methods. If we deem them to be mistaken, we have to meet and defeat them on their own ground. To anathematize them and stir up the passions of the ignorant against them is not identical with conquering the world for our Christian faith. What Gamaliel said is still true: "Refrain from these men and let them alone. For if this counsel or this work be of men, it will be overthrown; but if it is of God, you will not be able to overthrow them; lest haply you be found even to be fighting against God."

Moreover, I fail to notice any real discrepancy between the dogmas of the Church, f. inst., the Athanasian Creed, and the teachings of the Lucan gospel as explained by Usener, or Spitta. These two attempts to solve the mystery of the personality of Christ are moving along parallel lines which cannot intersect. Athanasius and his followers were primarily and chiefly concerned about the divine nature of our Lord. This divine nature existed long before his human birth. He is true God from all eternity. As such he is *ὁμοούσιος*, not merely *ὁμοιούσιος*. Athanasius teaches indeed that Jesus is also true man. But he came so dangerously near obscuring the humanity of Christ that again and again oecumenical councils were compelled to intercede.

Our modern theologians have taken up the task left undone by the old teachers. They desire to study the humanity of the Son of God. They start from an historical, not a philosophic-metaphysical standpoint. Their basis are the inspired documents of our religion. Even if we should in the end have to acknowledge that Jesus had a human father as well as a human

mother, that would simply teach us what we are confessing and believing even now: Jesus is not alone true God but likewise true man. His divinity would not be affected thereby. As far as his human nature is concerned, Jesus was not *ὁμοϊστος* but *ὁμοιωτός* with God, inasmuch as man has been created in the image of God.

I presume there may be some who will be greatly disturbed by this paper. To them I have to say: Refrain from preaching on any subject about which you have your doubts until you have reached again a state of confident certainty. Meanwhile, *Ora et Labora!* But even then remember we have to feed our flocks, not on theology, however interesting that may be to us, but on religion. There may be a few strong brethren in our congregations whose faith will be strengthened by allowing them to look into our theological laboratory. But duty as well as wisdom forbid most emphatically that we should offer to the congregations as a whole, doubtful and uncertain theological theories instead of the bread and water of life which we possess in the revelation of our Lord and Redeemer.

Pittsburg, Pa.

ARTICLE IV.

THE CHRISTIAN CONCEPTION OF GOD.

BY W. H. BRUCE CARNEY, A.M., B.D.

Some conception of God all men possess. "Atheism is but the vain attempt of some not to have." (1) For before the eye of sense and of reason lies the two-volumed book of the universe. He who runs must read. The contents of the one volume are the records of the rocks, and the rhythm of the vocal fields, all set in the broad pages of the circling seas. For vignettes, there are the mountains; and for fuller illustration, the kinetoscopic panorama of the seasons' drapery. Its cover is the blue vaulted night, mottled with stars.

The second volume is the world of mind. Its chapters are ideas, thoughts, feelings, volitions, intuitions, conscience, and the innate desire to know Him who is the author of it all. What is His name? What is His character?

I. CONCEPTIONS OF PHILOSOPHY.

There are those who say we cannot surely know, and would name the original thing, force, idea, or person, the Unknowable. This is the view of agnosticism.

The Pantheist ventures that the source of both volumes, of matter and of mind, is the same; viz., *an eternal, perfect substance*, impersonal and imperceptible, except in so far as we may know thought and extension, which are passing phenomena and attributes of this substance. God is the sum total of all things, hence everything is a part of God.

But as science, Pantheism fails to account for the evidence of personality in the world without, and for the personal consciousness of its possession within. Its philosophy cannot explain all the mysteries. As ethical soil, it is a barren waste. If all is God, the acts of men are the acts of God. There can be no more

(1) Nietzsche.

credit for a beautiful character than for a rose, "no history but natural history." And though it brings God "nearer than hands and feet," in us and of us, the impossibility of personal fellowship with Him, changes the sweet smile of assurance into the grim features of stoic fortitude and silent endurance of the blind inexorable law of the impersonal universe. Comfortless creed! How natural that the weary-hearted should choose rather the polytheistic rites in the consuming desire to draw nigh to a living God!

Thales (cir. 640-548 B. C.) is generally considered the first philosopher, that is, a scholar who attempted to account for the universe in a way different from the mythologies and writings of the poets. Because of its wide distribution and manifold combinations, he found in water the elemental and unifying principle of all things. All things, even the gods, spring from water. One of the latest thinkers of this materialistic development theory names the first element a *monad*.

But the theory of evolution as a means or cause of being has two classes of difficulties, viz., to account for all the facts; and second, to preserve its own identity. "One of the chief difficulties of the theory lies in its account of origins, another in its principle of continuity, and another in its principle of comprehension or inclusiveness." (2) How did pure matter get a start to evolve, if it was "homogeneous?" To allow the presence of a tendency to change its equilibrium is to admit a force, which is admitting two things with which to start the world, matter and force, thus loses its identity, becoming dualistic if not pantheistic in conception. To this conclusion Professor Haeckel has come, and endeavors to show how his monism differs from materialism in that the "one sole substance in the universe" has a law of two-fold potency. "We firmly adhere to the pure unequivocal monism of Spinoza: Matter or infinitely extended substance, and spirit (or energy), or sensitive and thinking substance, are the two fundamental attributes or principal properties of the all-embracing divine essence of the world, the universal substance." (3) If the learned Professor is rightly quoted below, this noted defender of Darwinism is now about ready to surrender uncondi-

(2) Mullins *Why is Christianity True*.

(3) Haeckel *The Riddle of the Universe*.

tionally:—"Most modern investigators of science have come to the conclusion that the doctrine of evolution is an error and cannot be supported."—The Bible Student and Teacher, Oct. 1908.

The principle of continuity is still waiting for the missing links to its chain of sequences. Prof. Wallace, an eminent evolutionist, allows at least three points where the continuity is broken, viz., The rise of life from the non-living, the origin of animal sensation and consciousness, and of man's moral nature. In the fields of psychology, ethics, and religion, which are included as subject to the law of evolution by many writers, the battle still wages with brightening prospects that the day rapidly nears when the assailants must retreat discomfited.

Idealistic monism meets with similar difficulties. It predicates as first cause an Idea. Says Romanes, "Mentality, idea, thought, are first in the world beginning, and all physical existence is derivative and secondary." Of those who deny personality to the Idea, an able advocate, Prof. John Caird, of Glasgow, admits that the theory is simply a "new pantheism." It therefore loses its identity. Romanes in his *Thoughts on Religion*, reached the opposite conclusion, viz., A theistic conception of the origin of the world. "At one time it seemed to me impossible that any proposition, verbally intelligible as such, could be more violently absurd than that of the doctrine of the Incarnation. Now I see that this standpoint is wholly irrational, due only to the blindness of reason itself promoted by purely scientific habits of thought." "In the same connection Romanes says that the doctrine of the Trinity is no more irrational than that of the Incarnation." (4)

We thus see that the natural conceptions of men are heterogeneous and in "unstable equilibrium." Under the impulse of some minds they tend to fall asunder, producing chaos and self-destruction. Directed by the mind and heart of others, they may evolve into the higher pantheism of the Brahmins, or the deism of a Socrates who saw the evidence of a personal Author in the wisdom and power displayed in the pages of the great world books. The Christian conception waits the coming of

(4) Mullin's *Why is Christianity True*. p. 67.

Him who was "in the beginning with God, by whom all things were made."

II. JUDAISM.

Beyond the deistic conceptions of Socrates and Plato, the "wise men and astrologers," can not "read the writing nor make known the interpretation thereof" because "the spirit of the holy gods" is not found in them. The God of our fathers therefore has appeared unto men, calling to one in the Garden, to another in the city, to another in the hidden recesses of the mountain's quietude. And to the summons, Moses, who had acquired all the learning of the Egyptians, their sciences and arts, philosophies and religion, gave heed; for to him the light of the burning bush appealed. Before its mystery he bowed body and spirit, because his great heart thirsted for knowledge of the living God. And having learned that of such a character was the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, he returned to the scenes of his childhood, purposing to emancipate and lead out a nation of toilers from the soil and support of the kings who fed him as a prince of the royal house, justified in his traitorous deed, nerved for its trying ordeals, and unwavering in its accomplishment,—all this done that thus they might possess the land which that God swore unto the fathers to give them. That he might commune with this God and thus learn more of him was his justification in retiring from the Israelites for forty days during which their longings and fears drove them to the flesh pots and the animal worship of Egypt. When he reappeared, while, because of the smoke and the earthquake, fear veiled their faces, the face of Moses shone. Ah, favored man! He had learned the secret of the universe, that for which the wisdom of this world has vainly striven, which Socrates and Plato almost found, who is the Author of the books; that back of water, monad, idea, and substance, was Jehovah, the living One,—*"in the beginning God."* And that through him this God had spoken to a world again enshrouded in darkness,—*"Let there be light!"*

The ancient world had never a clearer conception of God than that caught by Moses on Mt. Sinai, that God is a living, personal, infinite Being, creator and preserver of all things, holy and

righteous, "slow to anger and of great mercy," demanding first place in their hearts, worship and lives. This view of God transformed that rude mob of polytheists and idolaters at Sinai's base into a civilized and enlightened people, unexcelled in accomplishments, mighty, renowned, wealthy, a peculiar people, the keeper of God's oracles. Through them all nations of the world have been blest.

The articles of the Jewish faith as formulated by Maimonides (1135-1240 A. D.), still the formal creed of the orthodox Jews, are as follows:

"I. I believe, with a true and perfect faith, that God is the Creator, whose name be blessed, Governor and Maker of all creatures, and that he hath wrought all things, worketh, and shall work forever.

"II. I believe, with a perfect faith, that the Creator, whose name be blessed, is *one*, and that such a unity as is in him can be found in none other, and that he alone hath been our God, is, and shall forever be.

"III. I believe, with a perfect faith, that the Creator whose name be blessed, is not corporeal, nor to be comprehended with any bodily property, and that there is no bodily essence that can be likened unto him.

"IV. I believe, with a perfect faith, the Creator, whose name be blessed, to be the first and the last, that nothing was before him, and that he shall abide forever.

"V. I believe, with a perfect faith, that the Creator, whose name be blessed, is to be worshiped, and none else.

"VI. I believe, with a perfect faith, that all the words of the prophets are true.

"VII. I believe, with a perfect faith, the prophesies of Moses, our master—may he rest in peace—that he was the father and chief of all wise men that lived before him, or ever shall live after him.

"VIII. I believe that the law was given by Moses.

"IX. I believe that the law shall never be altered, and that God will give no other.

"X. I believe that God knows all the thoughts and actions of men.

XI. I believe that God will regard the works of all those who

perform what he commands, and that he will punish those who have transgressed his laws.

"XII. I believe that the Messiah is yet to come, though he tarry a long time.

"XIII. I believe that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, at the time when God shall see fit."

III. ETHNIC FAITHS.

But other men besides Moses have felt their minds and hearts unfed by what they could glean of God in the barren plains of philosophy and idolatry. And as the light which bathed Sinai's crest shed some faint rays upon its lower foot-hills, either by reflection or diffusion, so have other seers followed the gleam and reached higher or lower summits.

Zoroaster.—Among the founders of great religions no other, Moses excepted, caught a vision of so much truth as the originator of Parseeism. "His life is completely shrouded in darkness. Both the Greek and the Roman, and most of the Zend accounts of his life and works are legendary and utterly unhistorical." "It is almost certain that Zoroaster was one of the fire-priests, with whom the religious reform, which he carried out boldly, first arose." (5) This supposition would place him not later than 1000 B. C., though dates ranging from 6000 years before Plato to 550 B. C. have their advocates. It is clearly hazardous to venture therefore from whom he may have borrowed his teachings, if they did not originate with him. He was a monotheist, holding to the belief in the resurrection of the body, immortality of the soul, in a blessed existence as a reward for those "who diligently seek Him" and "never weary in well-doing." Upon the death of Cambyses, son of Cyrus, the priests endeavored to secure supreme rule and their number and influence were greatly reduced. When Persia was conquered by the Mohammedans, a band of Parsees escaped to India where, in Bombay, as a body of some 50,000 souls they still practice tithing, observe the distinction between clean and unclean meats, and render obedience and worship to the commands of the Zend-Avesta and to fire, the emblem to them of the holy God. As far

(5) *International Encyclopedia*, Art. Zoroaster.

as religion may be credited with the greatness of a nation, so far does this faith lay claim to greatness in being the inspiration of the great Medo-Persian kingdom. But its star has dimmed. Among all its wise and devoted magi, the wisest were those three who followed the guidance of a star which led them to David's city, "until it came and stood over the place where the young Child was."

Confucius.—The ancient Chinese believed in Shang-tee, [Supreme Lord], a naturally and morally perfect Being, who was worshipped by prayer and sacrifice, who exercises a providence over men, rewards the good, punishes the evil, even in this life, and ready to forgive the penitent. Lao-tse a reformer (Cir. 600 B. C.), taught that man's supreme duty and felicity lies in a state of perfect tranquility, with utter indifference to the past, present and future. Confucius (Cir. 550 B. C.), endeavored to restore the ancient faith, exhorting them to love their neighbors and obey the commands of heaven. The spirits of the good revisit their earthly habitations, and have the power of bestowing benefits. Worship of ancestors and divination has therefore flourished, and in place of the asceticism of Lao-tse being counteracted, new superstitions have been added to the former gross ones of China.

Hinduism.—More than two-thirds of India's 300,000,000 souls are affected by this religion which embraces 33,000,000 gods. And yet the question as to the Hindu conception of God might receive various answers, such as polytheism, animism, pantheism, tritheism or monotheism, depending upon what caste or persons we ask, or which of their Vedas we read. The fierce struggle for existence, the desire to win sanction for the licentiousness of the people, the fear of evil spirits, the desire early to win heaven and escape, some at least, of the possible 8,400,000 reincarnations into higher or lower beings, makes India a paradise for the gods, whether they be in stones, plants, or animals, whether living Brahmans or dead ancestors, demons, deified men or deified immoralities—all have a chance to be pleased in public or private devotions, with their rites and orgies, with the "vain repetitions" of names, baths, foods, sacrifices, with the assurance that caste rules will not allow any one god to gain a monopoly, nor any but the Brahmans to rise into the

saner teaching of the Rig-veda of one "only God above the gods," though He be but an "impersonal Spirit." "The following trite syllogism of Indian logicians is the only piece of formal reasoning universally known:

The whole world is under the power of the gods;
The gods are under the power of the mantras;
The mantras are under the power of the Brahman;
The Brahman is therefore our God."

—*India and Christian Opportunity.*

Buddha.—This great philosopher and reformer, born perhaps in 557 B. C., won great victories over caste and Brahmanic priest rule. His doctrine of Karma—one's future rebirth depending upon the character of the present life, Nirvana—final extinction of existence and identity, the merit of the ascetic life,—all had their bases in Hinduism. His doctrines of salvation to all, earned not by sacrifice but by right knowledge and conduct, the duty of charity to all, made Buddhism "at once the most intensely missionary and the most tolerant religion of the world." But its only god is fate, life is misery, death the only way of escape, final extinction of the soul the only goal, won after many rebirths and self-sacrificing existences. It is a religion of atheism, fate, death, and despair.

Mohamet.—One-seventh of the world's population turn their faces in daily prayers towards Mecca where in 570 A. D., "Allah's Apostle" was born. The prophet said, "It is incumbent upon the true believer to have a firm faith in six articles, viz., in God, His Angels, His books, His prophets, the day of judgment, and the predestination for good and evil." He enjoined five practical duties: "A Moslem is one who is resigned and obedient to God's will, and bears witness that there is no god but God and that Mohammed is His Apostle; and is steadfast in prayer, and gives alms, and fasts in the month of Ramazan, and makes a pilgrimage to Mecca, if he have the means," (6) The greatest glory of this faith is its hatred of idols,—the keeping of the first commandment; the greatest shame, the extent to

(6) *The Nearer and Farther East.*

which the commandments against lying and adultery are broken. It has been a "scourge of God," and today is a lingering menace to Christianity. For its adherents still believe the words of their apostle, "He who dies and has not fought for the religion of Islam, nor has even said in his heart, 'Would to God I were a champion that could die in the road of God,' is even as a hypocrite." To judge from the tone of a recent article by Sheikh Abd ul Hak of Bagdad, the sword of Islam remains in its scabbard simply because they fear the Lord is on the side which has the largest army. He says:—"For us in the world there are only believers and unbelievers; love, charity, fraternity towards believers; contempt, disgust, hatred, and war against unbelievers. Amongst unbelievers, the most hateful and criminal are those who, while recognizing God, attribute to Him earthly relationships, give Him a son, a mother," "Christians have in all times shown themselves our bitterest enemies.—Our most ardent aspiration and hope is to reach the happy day when we can efface the last vestiges of your accursed empire." (7)

Islam knows nothing of a God of love, He is a sovereign, whose favor is won by submission and meritorious deeds. There cannot therefore be any command in the Koran like, "Love your enemies, pray for those who spitefully use you." As a moral system it is little better than heathenism, allowing a sensual life here and offering a sensual heaven hereafter. The Christian standard is, "Be ye holy," "Be ye perfect," and offers a heaven of spiritual enjoyment.

IV. CHRISTIANITY.

Distinctive Traits.—It is therefore seen that the Christian conception of God is not distinct in that it sees Him as Creator, Preserver, and "Rewarder of those that diligently seek Him." Its characteristic features are not to be found in the Decalogue, the Lord's Prayer, nor in the first article of the Apostles' Creed; not in a heaven or hell, God and Satan, resurrection of the body and immortality of the soul; not in God's delight in prayer, praise, and worship, nor yet in giving alms and tithes of all we

(7) *The Nearer and Farther East*, p. 67.

possess. It is summed up in three words, "God is love." It is found in Jno. 3:16—God (a person) so loved (a conception foreign to most, if not all, heathen religions) the world (even the Jews thought God was partial to them) that He gave (the ethnic faiths think of God as asking all and giving little) His Son (the second article of the Apostles' Creed is distinctively Christian) that whosoever believeth (in Christianity alone does faith alone justify) on Him should not perish (neither body nor soul) but have everlasting life. (And where there is life there is identity, peace and joy.) "But the hour cometh when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth; for the Father seeketh such to worship Him."

Evidence of its Truth.—The Christian conception of God has the best claim to being the true one. It offers a *record of revelation unparalleled*, yet including all worthy of God or demanded by the reason of man which is attempted in other sacred and philosophic books. "Whence came the revelation of the true nature of God, and His relation to man, which is announced in the first verse of the Pentateuch, and which stamps the literature of the Old Testament to the end? It was certainly not from Babylon or Canaan that it was derived, still less from Egypt; like the gift of reason and speech which distinguishes man from the lower animals, it remains solitary and unique, a fact which we must accept, but which purely human science has failed to explain." (8)

These sacred records answer man's ever-present sense of sin and search for God by teaching that the way to reconciliation, redemption, sanctification, and acceptable service is through repentance and faith, acts of which all men are capable. Islam means *submission*; Buddha and Brahma demand submission. But what is submission to a principle when directed towards a person becomes faith and obedience.

As a *system of ethics* it is adapted to all nations. No system has excelled Judaism, except the one based upon these same moral laws as interpreted by Christ. Said Mathew Arnold, the renowned interpreter of the Sacred Books of the East, "I would not give one verse of the Sermon on the Mount for them all."

The standard of morality therein set forth is not too high for the most degraded people to attain to, neither has the most civilized as yet outgrown a single precept. The requirements of the Sermon on the Mount are practical and attainable. But the law of love to be obeyed presupposes a regenerated heart, a spirit-filled life. To enter the "narrow way" one must take to unlock its portals the prayer-key of St. Augustine:—"Give what thou commandest and command what thou wilt."

As a *system of religion*, it appeals to man as he is constituted. Man will worship. Strauss has proposed the universe as a proper object. Pantheism offers the eternal, impersonal essence of the same. But the common people outdo the philosophers in choosing instead some particular part of it, as a river, whose power they may fear; or a tree which they can admire; or the sun whose energy they can praise.

Comte proposed the worship of humanity. But Confucius was far wiser in suggesting particular persons, the Emperor and one's near ancestors. Christianity offers the Person of the world's God, the Father of all; Jesus Christ, the God-man, the Prince of the House of David; and God the Holy Ghost, the Power of God unto salvation.

Nothing else is offered to man so comprehensive as this. And all who view God as thus set forth for man's adoration find some point of contact with their religious consciousness. Evolutionists accord Christ the highest plane to which man has evolved. Atheists acknowledge His character to be transcendantly great. Deist and Unitarian place Him next to God. Educators find in His life their incentive, and political and economic reformers the basis of their doctrines in His teachings. The best philosophy sees in Him its goal, science its justification, art its divinest subject, music its highest inspiration, literature its greatest theme. So all who know Christ can say:

"If Jesus be a man
And only a man, I say,
Of all mankind I will follow Him
And follow Him alway.

"If Jesus be a God,
And the only God, I swear,
I will follow Him through heaven and hell,
The earth, the sea, and the air!"

—R. W. Gilder.

Apply the text of *human experience* as to the satisfying power of the Gospel when accepted by the heart and mind of men.

In connection with the First International Convention of the Young People's Missionary Movement, held at Pittsburg, March, 1908, there was a moving picture evening. One of the slides showed a scene in Allahabad, India, of an aged Hindu fakir, Ramyeed Das, beautiful and devout, taking his accustomed place in the street seated on a bed of spikes, a practice he had followed for thirteen years. When asked why he did this, he replied: Oh, Sir, that I might find peace." Asked if he found peace, he replied, "No, I have not found it." Having soon after died, his cruel instrument of self-torture was purchased and brought hither for our inspection in the Missionary Exhibit.

Contrast with this the personal experience of Christians. In prosperity or poverty, in life or death, men of all types have been able to say with Paul, "I know in whom I have believed; and that He is able to keep that which I have committed unto Him against that day!"

Christianity has met with unparalleled *success*, has borne much and unexcelled "fruit" by which it may be "known." Taking into consideration the extent and character of its *missionary* achievements it stands the test of *accomplishment*. It is the "light of the world." The light bearers were twelve obscure men, set for "witnesses both in Judea and to the uttermost parts of the earth." Its benign rays overcame the dire persecutions of the Jewish Church and of the Roman State. Beneath the *debris* of the Roman Empire and of the smothering structure of the papal hierarchy erected thereon, it smouldered during the Dark Ages. But live coals of the pure evangelical faith still glowed in the hearts of lone monks and in the teachings of the Montanists, Novatians, Donatists, Albigenses, Waldenses, the so-called heretical sects. Fanned into life by the breath of the Reformers, it ignited the accumulated *debris* of the ages, and

swept Europe with a conflagration in whose light the nations again saw and entered the path of civilization and progress. Carried thither by pious pilgrims, the innate right of every one to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" was radiated through every forest and valley,—our yet beaming beacon light. And heroes of the cross, unmatched in courage and devotion by the leaders in any political or religious movement, are carrying that light to civilization's out-posts, to the nations which yet sit in darkness, calling to them, "Arise, shine, for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee."

Affrighted at its white light of truth and purity, the hideous beasts of sensuality and heathen orgies are slinking to their lairs, and the sacred rights of childhood and womanhood are being seen and secured. Under the fusing power of God's love as manifested in Christ's death that all men might have life, the iron chains of slavery have melted, and the color lines of social caste and economic class are fast fading into white; and from the crucible of the world's life, in which its mental and moral elements seeth and hiss and sputter, is being poured out the cleansed gold of Christ-like character, glowing and bright like unto its purifying fire—the character which "thinketh no evil, endureth all things, rejoiceth in the truth."

"Let no man say, because high noon seems long in coming, that it will never come. Let us rather say, as we wait in the gloom, how glorious will that day be, of which the twilight dawn has lasted nineteen hundred years." (9)

Will the *Christian conception of God continue*, and be "a sun and shield?" The divine personality of Christ, the nature of His Gospel, the redemptive power of His moral precepts, the purpose of His miracles, the fact of His resurrection, the validity of His Testament, the power of His cross, will continue to enlighten and redeem men from their senses of guilt until they cease to be "altogether born in sin." When men shall be born without the sense of sin, all forms of religion will cease, leaving only philosophy and ethics,—our duty to our fellow-man.

But ethics must have a basis, a ground of right, and Christianity can best offer an ideal one. It fosters and supports that

(9) Dr. Alexander Maclaren.

Fraternity which is embodied in a universal society whose life is love and justice; that *Liberty* of body, mind, and soul which is accountable for its use and abuse; "as free, and not using liberty for a cloak of maliciousness, but as the servants of God;" (10) that equality which recognizes the common creation "of one blood all the nations;" the right of every man to count one and only one; and a just recompense for service to those who are "faithful over a few things" as well as those who are fortunate in having many. Until all this is actualized and the ideals realized which future ages will yet discover under the inspiration of a religion whose "God will have all men to be saved and to come to a knowledge of the truth," we need fear no finality of the Christian religion. For it will continue to be a perpetual incentive calling men to repentance and acceptance of Christ, being universal in its appeal and adaptability, and working in all men "that which is pleasing in His sight." "No precious or desirable item in the world's hopes are wanting in the cargo of spiritual goods which Christ is steering across the sea of time. No storm has yet made shipwreck of him or his. There is no sign in the sky that any storm can ever arise, and past history shows that there is no hidden rock, unknown to Him, which has power to bring on permanent disaster." (11)

Christian Conception of God is Absolutely True.—The Christian view of God is the absolutely true one. "Professor William James holds that every view of the universe below the personal plane, such as Materialism, and every view which seeks to go above or beyond the idea of a personal God, is doomed to be cast aside by man because they do not stimulate him to practical endeavor." (12) No view of the Creator can be so satisfying to the heart of man as to know God as *Father*; no force so potent to win men as *love*; no way of salvation so simple as *faith*; no hell so horrid as ours to shun because no other heaven so alluring to win.

Materialism is inadequate. Man is a person, and must have a personal god like unto himself. The Deist places Him too near the earth unless he exalts "Him far above all principalities and

'10) 1 Pet. 2:16.

(11) Mullins *Why is Christianity True*, p. 358.

12) *Ibid.*, p. 340.

powers." The Pantheist conceives Him too far from us and too base and finite when he considers all of man a part of God. Man is not the highest development of God, but God is the highest development in man. Only the part of man that is *from* God, His Spirit dwelling in man, is God.

Ah, Zoroaster and Confucius, Buddha and Mohamet, men behold you as stars twinkling in the night of ages past! Judaism, thou art as the moon, ruling the ancient night, and paling the stars with thy brilliancy! But thy light, like theirs, was only a reflection from the Sun of righteousness, rising with healing in his wings, causing the day to dawn over the world.

"We would see Jesus." And Greek and Jew, having seen Him will add also: "Show us the Father and it suffieth us." Having learned, "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father," with the disciples of old, men can say, "Lo, now speakest thou plainly—by this we know that thou camest forth from God."

Our view of God is *not yet complete*. "Now we know in part." But we KNOW! "Now we see in a mirror darkly." But we SEE! "But when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away." "Beloved, now we are the sons of God. And it doth not yet appear what we shall be. But we know that when He shall appear we shall be like Him; for we shall see Him as He is."

"Face to face shall I behold Him,
Far beyond the starry sky;
Face to face in all His glory,
I shall see Him bye and bye."

Garrett, Pa.

ARTICLE V.

THE APOLOGETIC VALUE OF ST. PAUL.

BY CHARLES WILLIAM HEATHCOTE, A.M., B.D.

Christianity is an established fact in the history of the world. It is the only religion that can be adapted to all classes and conditions of people. This fact was fully revealed by the Christ when He commanded His disciples to go into all parts of the world and preach, and baptize men in His name. But as they went about doing good, they should also beware of false prophets and teachers.

Many teachers and preachers have arisen in the past history of the world who claimed to be ambassadors of the Christ, whereas they were impostors and fanatics. They only served to bring disrepute on the glorious truths of Christianity.

Even in the Old Testament we have the prophets of the Lord God of Hosts rising up to defend His name against the assaults of the false prophets of Baal. The Christ was also attacked by His enemies, the Scribes and Pharisees, as being an impostor and a blasphemer. But the Son of God was able to prove His divine mission beyond all doubt and the scoffs and jeers of His enemies were unable to turn Him from His mission. Although they crucified the Master, nevertheless, they were unable to destroy His immortal truths. His apostles and disciples continued His work. Although the Scribes and Pharisees continued their persecutions against them, they became even more bold in their teaching and preaching. They counted it glory to endure suffering, pain and persecution for their beloved Lord and Master, Jesus Christ.

Perhaps the bitterest of Pharisaic persecutors was Saul. According to the interpretation he put upon God's Law he felt that it was his duty to persecute the followers of the Nazarene. However, after his vision on the way to Damascus he is no longer Saul the persecutor, but Paul the preacher, teacher and defender of Christianity.

Thus in the Christian writings and life of St. Paul is found

his great apologetic value for the Master's cause. The writings and teachings of St. Paul are more than an apology for Christianity. That is, they were not only prepared at that time for the Church, but for all time, as a defense of the principles and truths of the Christ. But they are truly apologetic in character, inasmuch as the writings go to the very essence of Christianity and reduce the truths to such a system that they can be used as a defense for the Church whenever the occasion may demand it. Or as Bruce (*Apologetic* p. 37) says, "Apologetic, then, as I conceive it, is a preparer of the way of faith, an aid to faith against doubts whensoever arising, especially such as are engendered by philosophy and science."

However, as time has gone on, certain philosophers and scientists have endeavored by destructive criticism to disprove the genuineness and authenticity of St. Paul's writings. Criticism of a higher nature has done much to strengthen Christian faith in the writings of St. Paul. There are thirteen epistles ascribed to him, and these *true* Christian scholarship accept as authentic and genuine.

Criticism of a destructive character has endeavored to undermine this faith, but the effort has failed. So many of the theories as propounded by the higher critics have been based upon such flimsy propositions that they would not justify the conclusions they endeavored to reach. The superstructure is too heavy for the foundation and the result is that a collapse must follow.

However, it is well to note that recent scholarship is beginning to recognize more and more the genuineness of Paul's epistles and the time is probably not far distant when most of the destructive critics will fall in line and likewise acknowledge the historicity, authenticity and genuineness of Paul's writings.

Dr. F. C. Baur of the Tübingen School accepted only four epistles (*Galatians, Romans, I and II Corinthians*) of Paul as genuine. Holtzmann and Pfleiderer who are later critics of the Tübingen School, accept in addition to the four mentioned, the genuineness of *I. Thessalonians, Philipians and Philemon*. Weiss accepts all the epistles except the *Pastorals*, about which he is somewhat in doubt. Zahn accepts all the Pauline epistles as genuine.

Thus, later criticism is assuming a more hopeful tone. The more radical critics are being displaced by those who are more conservative in their criticism. Dr. Salmon well says, (*Intro. N. Test.* p. 388), "I quite disbelieve that the early Christian Church was so taken possession of by forgers that almost all its genuine remains were corrupted or lost, while the spurious formed the greater bulk of what was thought worth preserving. The suspicions that have been expressed seem to me to pass the bounds of literary sanity. There are rogues in this world, and you do well to guard against them; but if you allow your mind to be poisoned by suspicion and take every man for a rogue, why, the rogue will conspire against you, and lock you up in a lunatic asylum."

To understand the great apologetic value of St. Paul, his life and surrounding conditions must be taken into careful consideration. His life, struggles and experiences are revealed in his epistles. There he gives us a vivid description of his struggle against Christianity. His life was such that it was not satisfied with a mere outward observance of forms and ceremonies. He was intensely religious and it is readily seen how he would become a fiery persecutor of the Christians. But as he struggled against Christianity he perceived that the Christians held tenaciously to their faith. And perhaps St. Paul, thoughtful man as he was, began to realize there was something after all in the system of the despised Messiah. On his way to Damascus he may have thought after all his struggles were in vain. When he received the beautiful vision of the persecuted Christ there seems to be a wavering in his mission to Damascus.

It is to the Acts of the Apostles that one must go for an account of Paul's life in detail. The trustworthiness of this splendid book of history is accepted generally by most critics. However, there are always some who think their one mission in life is to find flaws and endeavor to establish the untruthfulness of a certain book.

According to Acts 21:39, Paul said, "I am a Jew, of Tarsus in Cilicia, a citizen of no mean city." From this verse it is evident that Paul was born in Tarsus. He was a Roman citizen and it is probable that his father was a man of wealth. In his letter to the Phillipians he further described himself (Phil. 3:5,

6), circumcised the eighth day, of the stock of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, a Hebrew of Hebrews, as touching the law, a Pharisee, as touching zeal, persecuting the Church, as touching righteousness which is in the law, found blameless."

Of his early education he says, (Acts 22:3), "But brought up in this city (Jerusalem) at the feet of Gamaliel, instructed according to the strict manner of the law of our fathers, being zealous for God, even as ye all are this day."

As a young Pharisee he was trained carefully and thoroughly in the law under Gamaliel, the greatest Pharisee Doctor in Jerusalem. His parents were strict and wealthy Pharisees and gave their son the best education possible.

Paul's large acquaintance with Gentile and Jewish thought and customs was a force entering into his training for further work which at this time he was truly unconscious of.

His environment and association at Tarsus were broadening and deepening in their character. Tarsus, the capital city of Cilicia, was an important city. The university located there was well known and St. Paul may have attended it. Although many of the Jewish families would seriously object to sending their children to a Gentile university, nevertheless living in a university city itself with such privileges and opportunities as afforded by a city such as Tarsus, would be an education in itself. The Jewish youth would imbibe much Greek culture. It is likely that St. Paul attended the university as he is familiar with Greek philosophy, thought, culture and customs. He knew how to reach the cultured Greek mind as is shown by his able discourse on Mars Hill at Athens.

As was the custom of Jewish youths they learned some trade, however wealthy they may be. At Tarsus Paul learned the tent-making trade and years afterward when he was doing his grand work for the cause of Christ, he was independent and earned his living by it.

St. Paul's constitution was weak. He was often troubled with sickness and poor health. He was short in stature and his bodily presence was not pleasing to an audience. He was often held in ridicule by his hearers. Nevertheless, with all of his natural impediments, he was to accomplish what seemed *the impossible* for the Christ and the Church. Follow him over his

dangerous and arduous missionary journeys and the heart and soul are thrilled with the deeds he accomplished. Though facing enemies, dangers of all descriptions, his faith in God, his indomitable will, and his nervous energy gave him untold power and strength.

When he preached or debated he commanded attention and electrified his hearers. He was filled with love for the Christ. His mind was illuminated by the Holy Spirit. So great was his love for the Gentile and even for his own people that he endured all things gladly for the Gospel's sake. He loved the members of the Churches and he was their true pastor.

The turning point came in St. Paul's life when he was converted to the cause of Christ. As a zealous and enthusiastic Pharisee he had beheld the alarming growth of the Christian heresy. In his zeal he determined to do what he could to destroy and stamp it out. He had viewed with approval the murder of Stephen, and was commissioned by the High Priest to go to Damascus, to continue the persecution. Acts 9:3-6, "And as he journeyed, it came to pass that he drew nigh unto Damascus; and suddenly there shown round about him a light out of heaven; and he fell upon the earth, and he heard a voice saying unto him, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? And he said, who art thou, Lord? And he said, I am Jesus whom thou persecutest, but rise and enter into the city and it shall be told thee what thou must do."

It was in Damascus that Paul became "the chosen vessel of God." The crisis of his life had been reached. He was now being guided by the Spirit of Christ for the great work as preacher and defender of the faith. After his conversion he witnessed and preached for Christ in Damascus. He then retired to Arabia in order to meditate upon the great work that was before him. He needed strength and power in order to meet successfully the issues before him.

He returned from Arabia to Jerusalem and testified there for Christ, but he was held somewhat in suspicion by many of the leaders of the early Church. He received a vision, "Depart, for I will send thee forth far hence unto the Gentiles." He left Jerusalem and worked in Cilicia for several years until called by Barnabas to help him with the great work. He went forth.

unto Antioch and it was there that his great work really began. From this time on St. Paul became the great worker in the Christ's vineyard.

His life, then, was one of true self-denying and self-sacrificing service for the Master. His example of Christian living and activity showed that the ultimate end of life was not self nor seeking to develop selfish ambitions, but service for Christ. Or as St. Paul wrote from his prison home in Rome later in life unto the Philippian Church, "For to me to live is Christ." Living for Christ was the great central principle of his life after his conversion. It became more exemplified as he continued his work for the Master. The intensity of his service and power on his missionary journeys reveals the great apologetic value of his life to the world.

And as they ministered to the Lord and fasted, the Holy Spirit said, "Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them," Thus Paul with Barnabas and Mark sailed from Seleucia to Cyprus and thence to Salamis. At Paphos they converted the Roman Proconsul, Sergius Paulus, to the cause of Christ. This was at the beginning of their first famous missionary journey. Then they sailed from Paphos unto Perga in Pamphylia and passed on through Perga unto Pisidian Antioch. On the Sabbath day they entered the Synagogue and Paul was invited to speak to the people and so effective was his portrayal of the Christ's coming according to the Scriptures that they were asked to return again the next Sabbath. But the following Sabbath the Jews became jealous and persecuted them and they went to the Gentiles and many of them accepted the divine truths and believed in Christ.

They preached the Gospel successfully unto the people at Iconium, Lystra and Derbe, although persecuted and tortured by their enemies, the Jews, wherever it was possible. Though Paul and Barnabas were persecuted by their own countrymen they continued to seek out the Jewish synagogue in order that they might preach unto the Jews. However, they always found the Gentiles ready listeners to the cause they were presenting. They returned to Syrian Antioch after having been most successful on their missionary tour.

During their stay with the Christians at Antioch there arose

the question of circumcision with respect to the Gentiles. (Acts 15:1). And certain men came down from Judea and taught the brethren, saying, "Except ye be circumcised after the custom of Moses, ye cannot be saved. Finally a conference was called at Jerusalem and he defended the Gentile cause so strongly that it was useless to apply the Mosaic law to the Gentiles, and his contention was sustained by Peter and the other leaders. They realized that God had opened a door of faith unto the Gentiles (Acts 14:27), and St. Paul was to be the great missionary and preacher to carry the Gospel unto them. Thus Paul becomes the apostolic leader unto the Gentiles.

On his second missionary tour he again started from Syrian Antioch, accompanied by Silas. He revisited some of the places where he had established churches on his first journey. He worked successfully in Galatian territory, Troas, Philippi, Thessalonica, Beroea, Athens and Corinth. Though suffering privations, hardships, persecutions, he was strong in his preaching for Christ and he met with signal success.

After a short stay in Antioch he started out again on another missionary tour, this time accompanied by Timothy whom he had chosen on his second tour at Lystra. He went over some of the territory of his second journey and strengthened the struggling churches. Paul came to Ephesus and preached the power of Christ. Though persecuted he remained firm and the power of the Gospel triumphed. He also stopped at Troas, Assos, Mitylene, Miletus, Myra, Tyre, Caesarea and from thence he went to Jerusalem.

Thus, it is seen that Paul was signally successful in preaching Christ to the Gentiles. Though turned upon and persecuted by those of his own race, he was yet able to influence the Gentiles and large numbers of the leading people in the communities. In front of all opposition his faith in his mission and Christ never wavered. So intense was his zeal that he was ready to lay down his life for Christ and the Gospel.

Naturally, the question arises, wherein lay the secret of his power of defense? In what consisted his great apologetic value? He answered these questions himself (II. Cor. 11:23 et. al.) "Are they ministers of Christ? (I speak as one beside himself) I move; in labors more abundantly, in prisons more abundantly,

in stripes above measure, in deaths oft. Of the Jews five times received I forty stripes save one. Thrice was I beaten with rods, once was I stoned, thrice I suffered shipwreck, a night and a day have I been in the deep, in journeyings often, in perils of rivers, in perils of robbers, in perils from my countrymen, in perils from the Gentiles, in perils in the city, in perils in the wilderness, in perils in the sea, in perils among false brethren, in labor and travail, in watchings often, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness. Besides those things that are without, there is that which presseth upon me daily, anxiety for all the churches."

A man who endured this and more was no fanatic or self-deluded enthusiast. These facts themselves are sufficient apology for Christianity.

But the apologetic value of St. Paul rests not only in the power of his personality, but in his preaching, contentions and writings, all of which he did for the glory of Christ, not only for his own day but as a defense for Christians throughout the coming ages. (But he that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord. [2 Cor. 10:17].)

Paul showed that he was able to adapt the truths and principles of Christianity to all classes of people. In his discourse to the cultured Athenian audience he declared that God was Creator of all and He is also spirit. "The God that made the world and all things therein, he, being Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands."

Paul discloses the grand truth to the Gentiles of the Fatherhood of God. To the Romans he wrote from Corinth on his third missionary journey, "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, these are the sons of God." To the Father he ascribes love, justice, righteousness, mercy and grace.

There (Athens) Paul came in contact with the philosophers who had philosophized upon the probability of God. Socrates, Plato and Aristotle were Theists, and had bequeathed their philosophical systems to the Greeks as rich legacies. But none had been able to penetrate into the deep and yet practical speculations as to the reality of the Father as St. Paul and none could have set forth the principles so clearly and simply as he did to them. Paul did not present the Fatherhood of God in such a subtle way that they were unable to grasp his meaning. How

often, it is true in our own day, that many who are misguided by false philosophies are unable to come to a true conception of God. However, Paul has given the solution as to the existence of God in a few words. It was against false philosophy, gnosticism, that Paul wrote to the Colossians from his first imprisonment at Rome.

Paul also recognizes the power of God's grace. "Grace is the regnant word of Paul's theology. In this aspect he habitually sees God's face." (Hastings III., 718). It was through the Father's grace that he became an apostle. Romans 1:5, "Through whom we received grace and apostleship, unto obedience of faith among all the nations, for his name's sake."

Though Paul clearly states that God is full of love, mercy and compassion, yet he hates sin and shall punish the wrong doer. Romans 1:18, "For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hinder the truth in unrighteousness."

Paul recognizes the universality of sin and it originated in man's will. He never enters into an abstract discussion of sin nor does he state that matter is inherently evil, but he does state and that very clearly, i. e., sin is a reality and it will end in death. However, Paul realizes that man cannot be saved by his own merits. It is here that mercy, love and grace of God are manifested unto the world. In order that the world might be saved and redeemed from this sin, the love of God manifested itself to the world in sending the Christ to be the Redeemer, Reconciler and Saviour of men. (John 3;16.) "For God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten son, that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish but have everlasting life." Or when Paul wrote to the Galatians from Corinth on his third missionary tour (1:20), "I have been crucified with Christ; and it is no longer I that live, but Christ liveth in me; and that life which I now live in the flesh I live in faith, the faith which is in the Son of God, who loved me, and gave Himself up for me."

Thus Christ was willing to come unto the world in order to redeem and save mankind unto Eternal Life and at the same time reconcile man to God. Or as Stevens says, (Theo. N. T. p. 416), "Thus sin is pardoned in accord with absolute right-

eousness. Benevolence and holiness are equally manifested and realized in the work of Christ. What is done is righteously, as well as graciously, done. Mercy and justice are equally satisfied, and both the goodness and the severity of God equally illustrated." (Romans 5:10), "For if, while we were enemies, we were reconciled to God, through the death of his son, much more being reconciled, should we be saved by his life."

When Paul had returned to Jerusalem from his third missionary journey and was falsely accused by some of his own countrymen and as a prisoner in the hands of the Chief Captain of the Roman Guard, when he spoke unto the people how he was converted and that he was the missionary to the Gentiles they rejected him. Paul was kept a prisoner at Caesarea and when he perceived that he would not be given a fair trial, he asserted his Roman citizenship and appealed unto the Roman Emperor for trial. Thus Festus, the Roman Procurator, resolved to send him to Rome as soon as possible.

However, Paul was to make his defense on a certain day before King Herod Agrippa and Festus in order that he might clearly set forth his case to the Emperor. Paul told how he was converted and of his work to the Gentiles and Jews. He spoke of how that the Christ must suffer, and how that he first by the resurrection of the dead should proclaim light both to the people and to the Gentiles. And when King Agrippa replied sarcastically to Paul, "With but little persuasion thou wouldst fain make me a Christian." Paul replied earnestly and seriously, "I would to God that whether with little or with much not thou only, but also all that hear me this day, might become such as I am, except these bonds."

Paul arrived at Rome after having suffered innumerable hardships and privations.

Luke concludes his strong apologetic for Christianity, (Paul was given a fair trial and liberated), "And he abode two whole years in his own hired dwelling and received all that went in unto him, preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching the things concerning the Lord Jesus Christ with all boldness, none forbidding him."

The central theme of all Paul's preaching during his long ministry was, (1 Cor. 2:2), "I determined not to know anything

among you, save Jesus Christ and Him crucified." To many of the Jews the crucifixion of the Christ was disproof of his divinity, for they claimed that he was an impostor. However, Paul grappled truthfully with the problem and he took the crucifixion as the culminating point of the great plan of salvation. The glorified, risen Christ had appeared to him and said, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?" This fact not only strengthened Paul's faith, but he taught and preached the divinity, sinlessness and resurrection of the Master. For as in Adam all die so in Christ shall all be made alive.

Paul was fully acquainted with all the necessary details of the Christ's life. Stevens says (*Theology* p. 206), "Christ is descended from the fathers of the Jewish nation (Romans 9:5; Gal. 3:16), and indeed was 'born of the seed of David according to the flesh.'" (Rom. 1:3). He asserts that he received from the testimony of others the all-important facts of Christ's death, burial, resurrection and appearances, of which he enumerates five in detail (1 Cor. 15:3-7). He speaks so often of the crucifixion and sufferings of Christ as to leave no doubt that he had in his mind a clear and vivid picture of the Lord's death. He has also learned the circumstances regarding the betrayal of Jesus, and even the very words in which he instituted his memorial supper (1 Cor. xi. 23-25)—knowledge which he "received from the Lord, in the sense of having traced the usage which he found prevailing in the Church back to its source in the directions given at the institution of the ordinance."

Thus as St. Paul presented Christ to men they were able to have faith in him, that is to put their trust in him and be saved.

During Paul's first imprisonment in Rome he wrote epistles to the Philippians, Colossians, Philemon and the Ephesians. His letter to the Philippians was one of thanksgiving and exhorting them to live true to God; to the Colossians they were to beware of false doctrine as Christ alone was the Savior of the world; to Philemon, he writes that he should receive back in Christian fellowship his runaway slave Onesimus; to the Ephesians, that Christ has established the Church and is present in it though ascended to Heaven.

From all that can be learned Paul was freed from his Roman prison and spent perhaps a few years in preaching Christ to the

world and strengthening his converts in Christ. He wrote to Timothy, his young ambassador in Christ, (probably from Macedonia?) to Ephesus that he should remain true to Christ, and, "O Timothy, guard that which is committed to thee." (I Timothy 6:20). He also wrote to Titus, (probably from Macedonia?) his strong and faithful disciple at Crete to work faithfully among his people.

The second epistle to Timothy was probably written from Rome when Paul was about to suffer martyrdom. He bids Timothy a loving farewell. It is the great apostle's valedictory to the world and his friends. (2 Timothy 4:6), "I have fought the good fight, I have finished the course, I have kept the faith, henceforth there is laid up for me the crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give to me at that day; and not to me only, but also to all them that have loved his appearing. The noble apostle probably suffered martyrdom outside the Roman walls circa (68?) A. D.

Thus it is seen that the great apologetic value of St. Paul is found in his *life, personality, mission, preaching, teaching, writing and martyrdom*. Says Bruce (Apologetics p. 413), "The importance of the Apostle Paul to Christianity is universally acknowledged." He died a martyr to his convictions. He was willing to endure all things for the Master. He desired to convert souls to Christ, and he was successful. "For to me to live is Christ," was the keynote to his mission in the world.

Chambersburg, Pa.

ARTICLE VI.

THE POSITION OF THE CHURCH COLLEGE.

BY L. B. WOLF, D.D.

Solomon said: Prov. 4-5, "And with thy getting, get understanding." Jesus said: St. Luke 2-49, "Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business." St. Matthew, 6-32, "But seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you."

The acquisition of the power to do, to accomplish, is the demand of this age. It has little use for men who spin theories that cannot be practicalized. How to get this power, and when got, how to use it to the best advantage, in many circles is held to be the aim of a liberal education. This is almost axiomatic.

The mastery of matter, or the forces of nature, has been the achievement of the past generation,—the educated world has studied matter and lo! what mighty results in the physical have been secured, how comfortable a place the world has become, how full of good things nature is—what a store-house of blessings and how readily she has given up her treasures to man and his needs as well as to his pleasures.

But in this work it would be a great mistake to suppose that the *summum bonum* of life has been made possible. While time lasts it will ever be held true among the best men that the *mastering* mind is more to be coveted and admired and sought for, than the *mastered* matter.

It is no new thing that mankind has not occasionally, but often, failed to apprehend and emphasize this truth. In our best moments, however, we think, more of the inventor than of the invention, more of the master than of his mastered product, more of Edison than of the telephone, more of Marconi than of the Marconigram. And this, because our mental and spiritual activities, in the last analysis, claim more of our thought and admiration, than the results of their activity.

But we must admit that the latter have become too much the quest of man, and the development of mind and the formation

of character, that most vital to the individual, to the community and to the state, are made to play too small a part in our educational life.

The mastery of the forces and capacities of the mind by a controlling will, working for the well-being of man and the state, ought to be the end of all culture; and if this does not result, then the mere physical control of the forces of nature may be made to play havoc among men and nations.

Back of Maxim guns must be moral and spiritual forces, working for human good.

Unguided by proper functioning the mind is like an engine off the track, a power of infinite capacity aimlessly struggling in the midst of forces the real purpose of which it fails to apprehend.

A proper conception of the aim of education is to hold in even balance those eternal relations which exist between matter and mind and rightly to estimate the results and the effect of the same in things material, mental and spiritual, in human development. The high, higher and highest fruits of mental development must be carefully differentiated and estimated at their real face value. This is the serious business of our schools, colleges and universities and, especially, the work of the latter.

All schools, then, have a two-fold purpose to subserve,—to impart the highest culture and the best knowledge on all subjects that engage the human mind, and to form right character and so help in the great work of race-development. Our colleges and universities have assigned to them this same task at that point at which the public schools lay down their work. It is right that the school be practical and fit for material ends and conduce to material well-being, but it is not enough to stop here. We need the *reale-schule* of the German, but along with it there must be their gymnasium. Our schools must be practical and equip for civil, national and industrial requirements, but the nation must be developed also on those higher planes of thought and life without which no true development of a nation is possible. A nation will become strong as this two-fold task is kept well in the nation's eye in her educational work. The training of the religious, or as we prefer the spiritual, is claiming much attention among the leading nations at the present time. England is just

passing through the most exciting time over its educational bill, in which the religious provisions thereof well nigh defeated the party in power.

But the school cannot fail if it combine in its program of work, the improvement of the material, moral, national and spiritual life of its citizens.

But how to hand on its best product to the college and the university is not an easy question to solve. Suggestions have been made that the authorities of our high schools make a wise selection of the best material for college and university work. By wise selection and by careful recommendation young men may be guided into those lines of study and into those walks of life for which their powers best fit them. But such a plan cannot be worked, except for those who have not the means to go on in their studies and must depend on the state or private charity. In any case the work of the college and university is limited.

The sphere of the school is limited by many circumstances in the work which it must do for the race. Thousands of lads find the struggle for existence too keen and impelling to allow anything but a few years of high school life to fit them for life's conflicts. This may be hard on many a fine lad who would be a splendid piece of material for higher training, but these things must be expected in our present imperfect environment. Over against this, nature has given many only limited capacity, while others have the capacity but are wanting in inclination. And so it happens that the sphere of the college and university is limited in more ways than one and does not always get the best material on which to do their work. No fixed bounds can be set, but a vast field lies before them in which to carry on that great task that the school has but fairly commenced. They have a deeper, broader and higher work to do. It is not different in kind, only in degree, from that which the lower school has done for thousands and has only begun. Their product has now come under conditions of larger advantage in our colleges.

It will be readily apprehended, then, what the office of the college and university is. It is not necessary to distinguish between them. We have no theory to urge, but it would be well at least for each State to set up some standard of entrance to and of exit from, our colleges that would give our college men and

their degrees a recognized place among university men in other lands.

Standardization is a railway term, but it may serve to point to what might be done more or less in education; at least in each state, if not in the nation.

A Pennsylvania standard, maintained by all its colleges, would be in our humble opinion a great gain in our college life. A graduation standard would be even of greater influence. Educationally, our colleges could be as easily affiliated to each other as those of Oxford or Cambridge.

But at the present time the college and university must get the best product that it can from our lower schools for their sphere of work. If these schools were even half-ideal and maintained anything like the same standard throughout the country, they would turn out the product that would enable the college and university to do their work under much improved conditions. Certain it is that they must furnish material which will enable the college to give its attention to both sides of training, to fit for those departments of work which are solely practical and mechanical and to give the best culture for the various professional and higher artistic requirements of the age. We need clearly to grasp the limitations and the needs for which training is undergone and for the very divergent spheres for which men must be fitted. This makes the field of the college hard to fill. Trained mind is needed for a vast field of work in the world. The college must be determined on several things and be able to do work to fulfill well some of these demands, if not all, that are called for. It must carry on its work and fit for that material struggle, which plays so large a part in life. Its physical, mechanical, engineering, the modern side of its training, must be maintained in the most efficient manner. It does not matter if it had a hard time to get recognition in the university-life of England and Germany, it is a legitimate part of its work and must get a fair amount of attention in our college.

How far these two sides are to go and what their relative importance is, is the burning question in educational circles. The trend of the age in every land is to subordinate the mere training of the mind to that training of it that will fit it for some practical work in one of the many departments of material and in-

dustrial advancement. Too much attention is apt to be given to those things that will pay. There is danger that we as a people, overestimate the practical. Theories must be turned to account, they must be transformed into coin of the realm, they must, "make good." This is the cry of the hour.

It is not right or proper that this tendency should get too much the right of way in our colleges and universities. A place—not the place—or the only one, should be given it, in a well regulated educational system. This must be maintained. Under right proportions and wise restrictions, this practical demand must be met in our school, college and university. But neither their chief, nor highest work, is to train for the material well-being of the home, community or nation. To this, we must hold most tenaciously. Our schools and colleges occupy a more responsible place and have committed to them that which has to do with ethical and spiritual realities, and if they are found wanting here, they must be regarded largely as failures in the highest purpose for which they were established, by the Church and the State. This is felt by the State and the Church authorities the world round. England, France, Germany, and the United States are facing this great issue as never before. The struggle is on. All feel that the ship of state is in danger, when its crew has been trained only for harbor service and has not learned to battle with the *storm and stress*, the great issues of life and destiny. Men with their eyes well open to the past and with a keen vision for the future, recognize the fact that no mere material prosperity and the training that fits to bring it about, can maintain any nation or secure its highest well-being. Nothing but a symmetrical, normal, mental and moral development, can bring about this desired end. The lower and the higher must be held in right correlation and the higher must stoop to lift the lower up to its plane. The university is the place to which we must look for balance in a world so easily shaken from its true center. The Pisa tower may be a wonder in mechanical gymnastics, but no one would urge that we make it the model for our houses. The college is the place in which to study those great questions that enter into the community, State and Church life, and to reach right and sound conclusions. The influence of the material on the mental, aesthetic, ethical and spiritual cannot be

watched too carefully and no better place than the college can be found from which to watch these tendencies. We have the past to correct the present and to guide the future. Material ends may crowd out aesthetic; and material and aesthetic may push to the wall moral and spiritual. We may rejoice in material good, may develop a nation of Oscar Wildes and be mostly fools, unless we keep our eyes well open to all the elements that enter into race and character evolution. But if we maintain in proper proportions these elements in our intellectual training—link material, aesthetic, moral and spiritual in life's chain in right relation—there will result, in such union of the lower and the higher, a product that will meet all the demands of life. Then the beautiful and the good of every sort will result in right life and character. Every excellency is secured when the good is extracted from every element of life. It is the proper mixing of colors that is the secret of the painter's art. Now our colleges and universities must keep the right proportion and maintain the right balance in human development. When one is in danger of going to one side too much and is inclined to emphasize one-sided training, we must turn ourselves about and look out another that will throw the emphasis upon another side and so support that equilibrium, without which neither community nor nation can be rightly developed.

In this great task there is room, abundant, for the Church college or to put it more clearly, for the college under the control of the Church.

We cannot now enter into the question as to where the control of higher education should lie. No doubt there are those who think that the State's responsibility ends when it has laid down certain conditions according to which it will grant a college charter. We may say that this admits at least that the State has something to do with the control of the college. But according to many it does not go nearly far enough. Certain it is that the last word has not been said that will lay this question to rest. Wherever the right of control may lie and it may be that it ought to lie between the Church and the State in an harmonious correlation of governing functions, we are convinced that there must be an harmonious development of all those elements which make

for strong manhood and womanhood. On these true national, and the highest spiritual, life depends.

But how to secure this harmonious development amid all these conflicting elements and conditions is not easy of solution. We believe the Church college is in a position to help greatly in the task, if it remain true to its high calling and noble aim—exemplify the charter of the Church in the life of the college. Its maxims are those of the Church and it dare not neglect them, if it desire to continue its work and existence. It has held and still holds that its first and highest duty is to the Church and all other considerations must yield to this supreme claim. It is true that it must recognize lower considerations. There is no reason why a Church college should teach the physical sciences and all the departments of modern education less well than college and university whose sole business it is to teach these and nothing else. I am aware of our limitations, but claim that we ought in the name of the best—the highest institution—among men aim to give the best.

Our supreme aim is not so idealistic, nor are or ought our Church schools, be so influenced by our higher and nobler ideals, as to forget the lower and more practical, the real and material in training. But this does not, and should not keep them, from the full occupation of that position of vantage, which their very name and past history have secured for them.

Theirs is a unique place in the symmetrical development of the human mind,—the maintenance of that essential balance without which no proper human character can be reached and no true, national life attained. It is axiomatic, that Religion and Science in their highest and best forms, are so related as to prevent, when rightly understood and studied, anything like such sharp antagonisms and conflicts as have too often made the scientist appear most unscientific and the religionist most irreligious.

Church colleges and universities, then, have not only a unique position but also a most solemn trust laid upon them. Broadly, they must make ample provisions in their courses of study to meet reasonably the demand of the age and those requirements which human affairs make imperative. When nature yields to men her secrets and the call comes for enlarged study and investigation, the Church must not think that she is defiling her gar-

ments, when she opens her college halls for the study of all those process that have their end in the mastery of nature. There is little need to fear that we get to probing too deep into these problems which have for their end the compelling of the physical universe, to give to us her choicest treasures. The devout student of religion and the most learned scientist meet in the study of those phenomena which deal with mind and matter. In their search for the highest and the best, they must recognize the truth that they are seeking to get the mastery of the two enteties which have been the study of the race from the first. Our colleges and universities must, if they are to maintain their place of vantage, do just as good work in the physical as in the moral and spiritual. To do less would be to act beneath their opportunity and position,—to claim to do the best for man in his higher sphere of development and to fail to do on a lower plane what men may easily discover is second rate and inferior, is hardly honest.

The Church college has a duty to the individual, the community and to the State, which it is in the best possible position to fulfill. It stands as a constant witness to the truth that religion and mental culture are not antagonistic. They walk hand in hand. The highest point reached in mental culture is the best, and ought to be the best, starting point for religious development and soul-culture. And this it will be, if the attempt be seriously made, throughout the years of training, to show that to know more is to believe more, to read the unseen and the eternal in all the varied working of this mighty universe and to find at the heart of things a mighty God who holds the key that unlocks all difficulties, all mysteries. What the real danger is, that confronts every inquiring mind, is that development will be carried on with one-sided views and we shall get mental culture, minus faith, instead of mental development, the ripest and best, with a faith that ever sees the invisible and recognizes that the unseen and infinite is the loving Father of us all. And this is the real problem of education in all its higher forms. To maintain the two in even balance, to establish the former without neglecting the latter, to pursue the highest ideals of culture without impairing faith, religious hopes and aspirations, to make men see God and His gracious plan for the race, while they study to know the world around them with its momentous, natural questions, ever

pressing for answers—this is the real task, the noblest work, that the race demands of the Christian school and college. And the Church cannot afford to hand this work over to any but her ablest, most devoted sons. The best trained intellect is demanded for the task.

In this complex development, then the Christian college may well attend to the writer of the Proverbs, better yet to the words of the Master.

We have held up this ideal not as one easily attained, but as one worthy of the most determined effort. Two difficulties confront the Church college in attempting to realize its highest destiny:

(1) The ample endowments of those colleges and universities which hold out only material ends and let religion and faith survive or not as the student please; and (2) the danger, if not, the tendency, to copy these and fail to emphasize the main end and purpose of life, as centering in, and flowing from, a common brotherhood of man and Fatherhood of God. These two difficulties are real, and the Church of Christ must meet them. The world is very much with us and the other-world, our father's business, soul-culture and the correlation of the material and spiritual in proper relation in work and service is so ideal, so hard to keep in clear view. The Church cannot afford to go out of competition with those in the field of education that have lower aims. It must maintain standards in college life and equipment and this means that our Christian philanthropists must place their gifts on the altar to maintain our Church colleges on a par with those whose life is of the world and whose breath reeks with the malodor of this materialistic age. We have no word to say against their work as far as it goes, but we must say that their structure is a leaning tower and on it no secure home, community, and national life can be built. They lack the essential element. The spirit-culture must keep pace with the best mental culture.

Nothing remains, then, but to keep in mind true ideals in our college work. The moment the painter of the master-piece nods, his work is in danger of being spoiled. The chisel cannot cut true of him whose eye wanders. The marble under the hands of an Angelo will breathe forth its master's genius, only as he attends to every detail in stroke and form. The hand of Midas

cannot build the needed college to met the requirements and the peculiar problems of this age, but the hand of Midas may be guided by the hand of the Nazarine and the true end of the college and the end in view of our Master-Builder, may be realized.

This, then, is the conclusion that we have reached in the discussion of our theme. We believe that the Church college holds the real key to the situation and that under her guiding hand, complicated and difficult though her work may be, the best interests of the home, the community, and the nation shall be subserved. But this can be done in only one way, as the Church college lives up to the inspiring ideals which her Founder and Builder exemplified in His life and laid down as the cornerstone upon which alone men shall rear abiding structures. Through the material, to mental, aesthetic, ethical and spiritual ends must be the pathway trod in human development. The conservation of the higher by compelling the lower to keep its place must be the aim and end of the Church college. To understand the right relationship between mind and matter in all their varied forms and activities, must be the goal to reach which every endeavor must be put forth and every power used. To serve God, to be about our Father's business, in our Father's great house, the world—this sums up the higher and the highest aims of human activity. It is a privilege to live in such an age as this, but chiefly so, because we can bear witness to the truth, that with all its discoveries and inventions, its advancements in the arts and sciences, it has not surpassed in uplift, thought or conception, the blessed truth that Christ taught humanity, that to minister is better than to be ministered to, to sacrifice for others is better than to bask in the lap of luxury, to lose one's life in noble endeavor is a more precious legacy to hand on to posterity than to save it at the expense of the poor and needy. To die that others may live—this marks the highest reach of human thought, for it is God's thought and purpose for us as revealed in His Son.

Lutherville, Md.

ARTICLE VII.

CHARGE TO PROFESSOR LOYAL H. LARIMER, A.M.

BY LEANDER S. KEYSER, D.D.,

President of the Board of Directors of Wittenberg College.

MY DEAR BROTHER:

You have been duly elected by the Board of Directors of Wittenberg College to the important chair of Culler Professor of Old Testament Language and Literature. We are now gathered for the purpose of formally inducting you into your office. Your election to this position has given such general satisfaction to the Church that we cannot help looking upon it as a divine call. So far as we can interpret the ways of Providence, it was the will of Heaven that your honored and efficient predecessor should ascend into the celestial realms; no less does it seem to be the will of God that the mantle of our ascended Elijah should fall upon your shoulders as his successor.

We are not here to felicitate you because you have stepped into a position which will afford you a larger income; that would be mercenary. Besides, there is no prospect of a teacher in Hamma Divinity School ever accumulating a fortune—at least, on his salary. Neither shall we congratulate you on the honor that has been conferred upon you, for that would be using the phraseology and sentiment of worldly ambition, and we believe a teacher of theology should be above that. Our great and impelling reason for felicitating you is that you have been called to a position of exceptional opportunity—one in which your teaching and personal influence will tell on character and destiny. To mould the life and thought and habit of young men who shall go out to preach the Gospel—what a privilege is that! what a splendid vocation! How far-reaching the influence of such a work! In the years to come when men, graduating from our school of the prophets, shall go forth to proclaim the riches of Christ, it will be you and your colleagues who will be preaching by proxy in many Lutheran pulpits scattered throughout this

and other lands. Is not that a view with a thrilling foreground and an enchanting perspective? You will thus be able to multiply your influences. I do not wonder that, much as you loved the people of your pastorate and loath as they were to give you up, you could not resist the spiritual attractions of this call.

But expressions of joy should not be all on one side. Our Church and our Divinity School also have cause to indulge in expressions of delight. We have every reason to believe that you are well fitted both by nature and grace for the place you have been called to occupy. First, we have confidence that you are a sincere Christian man; and that this is the highest praise I am going to bestow upon you this evening—a sincere Christian man; a man whose life will exemplify and enforce your teaching and give spiritual atmosphere to the professorship you hold. Had we not known you to be a consistent Christian man, we should never have given you our suffrages for this position.

Then, we are confident that you are "apt to teach"—a Scriptural qualification. Skill in imparting instruction is just as necessary in the Divinity School as in the college or the public school. True pedagogical principles and methods ought to prevail in imparting theological knowledge. There is no danger that your students shall know too much. Other things being equal—remember, however, the qualifying phrase—the more knowledge they have at their command, the more edifying and effective will be their preaching. But teaching does not consist solely or even chiefly in cramming the head with lore. To educate means to *draw out*. Hence a large part of your work in the class room will be to develop and discipline the mental and spiritual powers of your pupils. The ability to hunt down a subject to its last analysis is more to be desired than the ability to recite many chronological tables or to conjugate all the Hebrew verbs, regular and irregular. I think that one of the poorest sermons I ever heard contained the largest number of verses quoted from the Bible—quoted from memory, too, with the book, chapter and verse given in every instance. Why was it so ineffective a sermon? Because it was a mere exploit of memory, a species of mental gymnastics, with no logical connection between the different tumbles and tilts, so that when the sermon was done, no one could remember a single thought that the

speaker had tried to impress. Such sermons display an undisciplined mind, and cannot be effective. As a true teacher you will endeavor so to train the minds and hearts of your students that they shall make competent use of their knowledge. What is the definition of an educated minister? He is a minister who can use all his knowledge without pedantry, and transfuse it with spiritual power. Somehow, we feel, my brother, that you have special expertness in helping to train ministers of this stamp.

Again, while you are not a large man physically, you are a man of marked and forceful personality. You will not, I feel sure, be a mere figurehead in the class room. You will exercise kind but firm discipline over your pupils. You will leave the impress of your own individuality upon their characters. This is vital. We need men of strong personal qualities in our theological chairs. Some of us who have been outside of the seminary rooms for a good many years still feel the formative influences of some of our teachers. We have been more spiritually minded because of them, more virile in our proclamation of gospel truth.

Then, too, your ability and experience as a preacher and pastor encourage us to feel that our choice has been a wise one. A man still in the prime of life, you will move among the churches, and many pulpits will be open to you, and we know that, whether you preach extemporaneously or from manuscript, you will bring no discredit upon the Gospel, the Divinity School, or the Lutheran Church. One of the special reasons why some of us were anxious to secure you for this position was that we were aware of your ability as a preacher and your fidelity as a pastor.

Your chair is an important one—that of professor of Old Testament Language and Literature. The rationalistic criticism has tried to rob us of much of the Old Testament, and thus has done much to undermine the faith of the people in the whole Bible. We are sure that you will take a safe and conservative position regarding all the Old Testament problems, and that the young men who shall sit at your feet will not go out into the churches to preach an emasculated and disreputed Bible. Your teaching will always carry the strength which comes from positiveness. For the most part, you will perhaps be irenic; but

when occasion requires you will not shrink from entering the field of polemics. You will teach your students that the Old Testament is a vital part of God's revelation to the world; that what is recited therein as history is history, and only what is evidently rehearsed as allegory or parable belongs to that rhetorical category; that the whole Bible is a living organism and not a lot of *disjecta membra*; that the Old Testament is the soil and root out of which the New Testament has grown; and that, therefore, the Old is as necessary to a proper understanding and appreciation of the history and fact of redemption as the New. On the other hand, I do not think you will fight shy of the difficulties, nor keep your students in ignorance of what the negative critics have to say about the Old Testament. You believe in the most thorough-going research and inquiry, sifting all the processes of rationalizing and showing just wherein they are defective. To be forewarned is to be forearmed—that will be one of your maxims in the training of your pupils. You will not send them out unfortified against the opposition they will be sure to meet when they enter upon the active duties of their ministerial lives.

There is another point that I feel constrained to urge on this occasion. I hope it will not be looked upon as presumption on my part, nor as the faintest hint of criticism of the methods of instruction heretofore in vogue in the seminary. It is not so intended by your speaker. I know the thought is already in your mind, as well as in the minds of your honored colleagues in Hamma Divinity School. Few things have afforded us more gratification than some of the statements you have made in your schedule of studies published in the catalogue of the seminary for the coming year. Three times you make the statement that much attention will be given in your department to the practical uses to be made of the Old Testament in preaching. That is precisely the point I wish to emphasize. Your interest in the Hebrew language and exegesis will not be merely scholastic; it will be chiefly religious and practical; it will be permeated through and through with the homiletic spirit. I take it for granted that you will be thorough; but you will be more than a mere drillmaster. The main purpose of a theological school is not to make great Hebraists, or Greek experts, or even theolo-

gians, or great scholars in general. True, here and there one of your students will develop a marked aptitude for academic pursuits, and will therefore become a specialist in some line of theological study; and that will be as it should be; for the Church has need of such men, especially for our chairs of instruction.

But even such men should feel a great deal more than a mere academic interest in the special lines of study they pursue. The main object of a divinity school is to train preachers and pastors, not to turn out academists and theologians. The vast majority of your pupils will become pastors of churches. They will preach to many plain and unlearned people, as well as to those of greater culture. What the Church needs above all is good preachers and pastors; nay, the word "good" is too tame, too colorless. What the Church needs is virile, magnetic, thrilling preachers of the Gospel; not only good and pious men, though piety is a prime essential, but men of forceful personality, men who can win, persuade, fire and move. We want men who succeed; who succeed by proper Gospel methods, to be sure; but men who *succeed*. Let us have ministers who are transformed by spiritual power, and who can tell the Gospel story in a winsome, intensely absorbing and effective way.

Therefore you are right, my brother, when you announce that you will not teach Hebrew and exegesis and Old Testament literature in merely an academic way, but also with the purpose of establishing the vital connection between your teaching in the class room and the all-important function of gospel preaching. While you are teaching the branches pertaining to your department, you will ever keep your mind in a homiletic attitude, and will show your students how to find material and inspiration in the Old Testament for effective sermons. Thus your chair and the other chairs in the seminary will harmonize and abet one another, each contributing its share in training and sending forth men who shall be successful preachers and pastors.

It is needless for me to say that you will not send men of weak and colorless Lutheranism into the ministry of the Lutheran Church. That would be so unwise as to be practically suicidal. The Lutheran Church has proved herself vitalized with power because of the doctrines she holds that we cannot afford to tolerate without strong protest any attempt to de-Lutheranize the

Lutheran Church. Such an attempt in a theological school would be especially disastrous. We have no fear with regard to the position of the teachers in Hamma Divinity School. You and your colleagues are committed by training, conviction and formal obligation to the Lutheran conception of Biblical doctrine. You heartily accept and will teach the system of doctrine set forth in the Augsburg Confession, as well as all the detailed statements of that great confessional document. Feeling sure that you will in your inaugural address, to which we shall presently listen, make a full and unequivocal statement of your position relative to our Lutheran system of doctrine, I deem it unnecessary to dilate further upon that phase of the subject.

In closing, I heartily congratulate you again on your opportunity to serve the Church and the kingdom of God; I congratulate the Church on securing the services of one who evinces such sterling worth; and wish you many years of usefulness and success.

Canal Dover, Ohio.

THE NEED FOR POSITIVE PREACHING.*

BY PROFESSOR L. H. LARIMER, A.M.

MR. PRESIDENT, Members of the Board of Directors, the Faculty of Hamma Divinity School and of Wittenberg College, Friends and Patrons of this Institution: The word which has been spoken by the President of the Board of Directors brings me great pleasure and satisfaction. I have listened to his word because of its official significance, and I have been deeply impressed with the charge which has been given.

It has been spoken by one who is an ardent and unquestioned representative of all that this institution stands for; and he has spoken this word to-night out of the fulness of his heart, and the largeness of his understanding.

* Inaugural on taking the Chair of Old Testament Language and Literature in Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, Ohio, September 9th, 1908.

I have listened to the word to-night for another reason. It was not the voice of a stranger, nor of a chance acquaintance, but it was the voice of a friend and neighbor with whom in delightful companionship, in an adjacent pastorate, I have labored in recent years—years that will always be to me a happy memory.

In the pleasure and opportunity which this hour affords me, I can not refrain from alluding to this relationship, and from expressing myself as doubly glad that in this hour when a new and responsible work is placed upon me, the voice that comes to my heart and the hand that touches me, is the sympathetic voice and the steadying hand of him whom I have valued so highly as a friend and a neighbor.

We are here to-night not only in the interest of a department of instruction in a school of theology, known as the Chair of Old Testament Language and Literature. That in itself would be sufficient to enlist our attention, for it covers an unbounded realm of scholarship and of searching after divine things. But rather are we here to-night because of our interest in something which is farther reaching, and to which this department of instruction is only contributory. Our *supreme* interest is concerning the preaching of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Your institution of learning has that for its chiefest aim. You had rather succeed in the work of training young men properly to be clear and forceful preachers of the Word of God, than succeed in anything else. For that purpose your institution was built. With that prayer, its foundation was laid. By that spirit, it has been nurtured and sustained. Our *chief* question, then, to-night, is concerning the preaching of the Gospel, and the subject to which I would especially call your attention is this: *The Need for Positive Preaching.*

This subject should be of vital interest to one who is entrusted with the department of instruction in Old Testament Language and Literature. This field of study has become a fierce battleground. It is not my purpose to review the struggle that has been carried on in the last half century, as to the origin, and form, and value of the books of the Old Testament. The Graf-Kuenen-Wellhausen School has for its basis the denial of the supernatural in the Scripture. However, not all who have been

followers of that school have gone to the same extreme in their denial of the supernatural. There can hardly be a classification of all the views which have been entertained by this class of thinkers. They are widely variant. But running through all these views from the most unimaginable extravagances to those views which may be more plausible, there is found to be lurking a suspicion of the supernatural. The most conservative of that school have put the question mark at the end of every Scripture statement which involves the supernatural, and in many instances they have left the question mark there. This attitude of the critical school towards the supernatural, together with the whole attack on the historicity of much of the Old Testament, and upon the traditional views held by the Church concerning the origin of these writings—has occasioned much anxiety and confusion. Many books have been written, and extravagant claims have been made in behalf of this school of criticism.

In the midst of all this, one could easily lose his bearings, and find himself adrift on the wide expanse of critical discussion. This is indeed what has happened to many. It has happened to some teachers in schools of theology; it has happened to many preachers whose sole occupation is to teach and to preach the whole Bible; it has happened to many in the rank and file of the Church, and it has been seized upon by many outside the Church as their reason for not accepting the Bible. This has been going on to such an extent that the age seems to be hypercritical in its attitude towards the Scripture, and the Old Testament especially has been made the object of signal attack.

In this controversy two questions have been raised and have demanded an answer. The one question is, Can the religion of the Israelites as it is presented in the Old Testament, be accounted for on a naturalistic basis? Did it begin, and was it developed through the centuries, without the direct or immediate agency of the supernatural?

The other question is concerning the literature of the people. Is the Old Testament a correct and faithful record of the history and religion of the Israelites, and of God's dealings with men, or is it a mixture of fact and fancy—a creation of pious imagination, or a product of inspiration?

The attack that has been made upon the supernatural has already been followed by reaction. The contention of the more radical critics that the Christian religion is "nothing less, and nothing more," than the other religions of the world, so far as its origin and development is concerned, has served only to show the inadequacy of such a position. The denial of the supernatural when it is followed out to its legitimate conclusions works its own havoc. It builds up the very things which it was intended to pull down. Prof. James Orr says: "It is not too much to say that one direct result of the application of the strictest historical and critical methods to the Old Testament has been to bring out as never before the absolutely unique and marvellous character of the religion of Israel. With the best will in the world to explain the religious development of Israel out of natural factors, the efforts of the critics have resulted, in the view of many of themselves in a magnificent demonstration of the immense, and on natural principles, inexplicable difference between the religion of this obscure people and every other."

The same positive result can only come from the literary question. As a piece of literature, the Bible is to be studied the same as any other book, or collection of books. You want to know who were the authors, and the date of writing, and their sources of material, and thus to be sure of the reliability of the record. All this can be done. It has to be done, in order that the inquiring mind may satisfy itself. But after it has been done, and books and chapters, and verses, and words, have come under the closest investigation—we still have the Old Testament left in its entirety. It is a reliable record. It can still be preached. You can preach its great thought from the first of Genesis to the last of Malachi.

One must not be alarmed in the least as to the outcome of any investigation or hostile attack that may be made on the integrity and the reliability of the Scripture record.

I.

Now the supreme necessity for our age as for every age is that men and women shall come into possession of the teachings of the Scriptures. The need of the world is to hear this Word of

God in its totality, with all its richness, variety, and beauty, with its power to impart new life, and to save from sin and death.

So far as the preacher is concerned, he need not approach his work with a lot of critical apparatus. The responsibility placed upon him is not to dissect the Word, but to hold it forth before a sinful world, as its only hope of healing. It must be preached in its grandeur, and with its reach of thought from eternity to eternity. The man who stands in the pulpit must be a positive man, who has grasped the main contents of the Word of God, and with a force born of the deepest conviction, he is to declare that Word as one who is sent of God.

The high ideal of preaching is that the preacher should strive to think over again the thoughts of the sacred writers; and then he is to strive to communicate them to others. The preacher is to have in his mind and heart the same thought which throbbed in the mind and heart of Moses, or David, or Isaiah, or Paul, or Peter, or John, or Christ.

What dignity, what sublimity, this gives to preaching! The preacher steps into his pulpit. He is fresh and vigorous. A tremendous thought possesses him, drives him to his feet. It is a thought which once possessed, and drove Isaiah, Paul and Christ.

Do you talk about inducements to the ministry? It needs no inducements. The fact that the humble, but faithful preacher can come into possession, and under the dominion of the same lofty and God-given thoughts which ages ago shook men's hearts, and is still able to pierce them through, is inducement enough for devoting one's self to the work of preaching. The lawyer has no message compared with the preacher. The statesman in legislative hall, standing for some measure that may mean good to many millions, still does not have a message equal to the preacher who stands in his pulpit charged and surcharged with a message to the souls of men,—a message not original, because it belonged to prophet or apostle, yet it is his own message because the self-same Spirit that worked in the mind of prophet or apostle or evangelist has been at work in his own mind.

The preacher must be an architect of Biblical thought. Like the man who draws his plan for some large and massive, and

well-arranged building, and then puts his men to work with tools and materials, to give body to the structure which he has been carrying in his mind, so the preacher has a vision of spiritual things, derived from close adherence to the Word of Scripture, and then he bodies forth that spiritual conception. The architect who builds his house first in his mind, and afterward on the avenue, has given energy, painstaking care, and skill through many days, weeks, months, perhaps years.

The preacher has to exercise the same energy, the same patience, the same skill. He must thoroughly apply himself to this work. That is the only way to preach. If it is important that houses be made safe and strong, for men to dwell in, it is equally necessary that the spiritual conceptions which are formed for them to live in until they die, should be safe and strong. Did I say that this spiritual conception is the house the man is to live in until he dies? It should be so good, so substantial, so eternal that he could live in it after he dies.

Yes, the preacher must be a builder, a builder of habitations for the souls of his hearers. His congregation is before him on Sunday morning. There are the young people with their untraveled years stretching out before them; there are men and women upon whose shoulders are resting the burdens of hard work; there are the aged whose work is over, and who are now in the waiting period of life; there are the poor and the rich; there are the fortunate and unfortunate; there are the sad and the lonely, the gleeful, the happy-hearted. His congregation is small, you say—but they are all there. The preacher should see in his smallest congregation a thousand wants to be gratified, a thousand needs to be ministered unto. Some of those people are homeless. Perhaps more of that congregation are houseless than the preacher is aware of. His is the golden opportunity, and the God-imposed responsibility of housing those people spiritually.

Does this stagger the preacher? Does he exclaim, "Who is sufficient for these things?" Yes. But he has plenty of material given him. He is not to make bricks without straw. The preacher should be able to unwind Scripture, get hold of its central thought, wind it up again, and give it to his hearers. They will go home with something. They will go home with the Word of God. Of course this is not done easily. It is not a

lazy man's work. The preacher's soul hovered over his text, until it had passed from the Bible into his heart of hearts, and he hovered over it yet longer until he had a clear intellectual grasp of His Word, and then he was ready to preach.

This is the unfolding and the opening up of the Scripture. This is the kind of preaching most needed—a clear, plain, positive setting forth of the thought of God's Word. The Scriptures are a sealed book to most people. They do not read the Bible much. They read other books and many magazines, and large dailies. A good many people of culture have more magazine religion, than Bible religion. One of the preacher's tasks is to make the Bible an interesting book. It is not enough to believe in the Bible as an inspired book. Most people believe that. It is not enough to believe in the Bible as a good book. Most people know that much. But people need to know that the Bible is a readable book. The preacher should prepare himself to show his congregation the readableness of the Bible.

A recent writer of large experience, in speaking of the disregard of Bible reading and Bible study has this to say: "The Church as a whole can not be said to be alive to the Word of God. It fears the drudgery of searching the Scripture, and knows far too little of the joy and plentitude of it. No problem of Church life equals this one; yet it has scarcely received adequate attention in modern study of Church questions. Questions of organization, of theology, of extension, have received larger attention. Meantime the greatest of all questions—how to reach the people efficiently with the Word?—has been too lightly considered."

Expository preaching is well adapted to lead people into the Bible. This was the primitive method of preaching. It was the style of the apostles, and evangelists.

No other style of preaching calls for so many faculties, and so many gifts. It calls for imagination, close reasoning, wide reading, apt illustration, interesting exegesis, and the application of the Scripture thought to present conditions. The Bible must be preached in its entirety, as well as in its details. The preacher should have grasp of its mighty scope of thought. Dr. Forsythe in his Yale lecture says this forcible word: "The preacher must cultivate more the free, large, and organic treatment of the Bible, where each part is most valuable for its contribution to a

living, evangelical whole, and where that whole is articulated into the great course of human history. The Bible is primarily for a single and public purpose, for a purpose of the race. It is then not as a fountain of stray suggestion, but as a channel of positive revelation and a source of spiritual authority. Bible preaching means leading people into the Bible and its powers. It is not leading them out of the Bible into subjectivities, fancies, quips or queries."

It is a tremendous work to preach the Bible, but that is what must be preached—the Bible in its totality and in its purity. Bishop Beveridge, who is numbered as one of the classic preachers of the English Church, said, more than 200 years ago: "We live in an age and among a people, that place a great part, if not the whole of their religion in hearing sermons," and then he made the complaint, "We find but few who are even the more religious for all that they hear."

There are many people yet, whose religion lies more in the hearing of sermons, than in the doing of them. However that may be, let the preacher be sure of one thing. Let him preach Scripture thought. There is nothing else that can move the souls of men. The Word of God alone is "living, and active, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing of soul and spirit, of both joints and marrow, and quick to discern the thoughts and intents of the heart."

What is needed above everything else in our time to counteract the many phases of unbelief which are in the air, is that clear, and plain, and pungent, and positive preaching which brings the pure, undiluted truths of Scripture into the hearts of men.

As contributing towards this end, the place given to the study of the Hebrew Scriptures in a theological course should need no defense. There has been much discussion in recent years concerning the course of instruction which is best adapted to prepare young men for preaching.

Many have suggested the pursuit of scientific and sociological studies, so that the preaching will be more modern. Some have gone so far as to advise the elimination of the study of Hebrew, in order that more time may be left for what they term the more practical studies.

But if we bear in mind that the preacher is to be a master in Scripture thought, rather than an encyclopedia on scientific, psychological, sociological, and literary subjects, then we will see the helpfulness and the necessity of study of the Hebrew Scriptures.

In a recent article on the "Homeletical Worth of Hebrew," Professor Donovan of the Newton Theological Institution, uses these forcible words: "Without some intelligent appreciation of the thought method of the Semites, the preacher finds the best commentary on the Old Testament virtually locked against him. As a consequence he will either make the egregious mistake of ignoring that Testament in his preaching, or he will discover that he is constantly groping to reach an understanding of matters which he might have grasped with far less labor if only a part of that labor had been put upon a brief earnest grapple directly with the Hebrew. More than one busy pastor has in later years taken up this course omitted from his earlier preparation. Hebrew is here put as the representative of all the Semitic languages because it offers their advantages with as few difficulties as any of the group would present, while, owing to its history and the contents of its literature, it is for the preacher the most valuable of them all."

In this same article from which I have quoted, the writer sets forth some of the distinct advantages to be derived from a study of the Hebrew.

First is a development of personality, which includes a broadening of the intellectual horizon by accustoming the mind to new views and distinctions, also a deepening of sympathy as the emotional traits of another race are explored.

The second profit is that of precision and discrimination in thought which is a valuable asset to the preacher.

The third advantage is the skill it will give the preacher in appealing to the deeper emotions and will of men.

The fourth advantage is the inspirational gain which arises from direct contact with the ancient vehicle of inspiration.

It would be difficult to set forth the general advantages of the study of Hebrew more clearly than in this analysis I have referred to. A careful and intellectual study of the Hebrew Scriptures, pursued during the years of theological training, will give

an impetus to the study and preaching of the Old Testament Scriptures which can not be acquired in any other way. The study of Hebrew in a theological school is not for the purpose of making Hebrew specialists, but for the purpose of helping to make effective preachers. Whatever time the student devotes towards acquiring a fair degree of proficiency in reading the Old Testament in Hebrew is so much time saved.

The preacher needs to study many subjects. He certainly should be a student of the age in which he is living. He should be acquainted with the needs of men, but first of all, he must have a knowledge of God. The purpose of Hebrew study as it is taught in a school of theology is to bring the student into the closest possible contact with Old Testament thought. There is need for the positive preaching of the Old Testament as well as of the New Testament. The Gospel of Christ Jesus is the water mark that is to be found on every page of the Old Testament: "There is not a page of the New Testament which will not clothe itself in fresh beauty and power when it is historically related to the antecedent life and thought of the Jewish people."

The Old and the New Testament constitute an *organic unity*. If one is to be a rich and unfailing preacher, he must have a comprehensive grasp of the whole revelation in the Holy Scriptures.

We are not in need of expert critics, but we are in need of positive preachers who can preach the Bible from Genesis to Revelation, and to that end chief attention should be given in the work of training young men for the gospel ministry

II.

And now, Mr. President, I wish to express myself upon another matter which has much to do with the positive preaching of the Word of God. *The preacher must stand on a strong confessional basis.* The faith which the preacher, and the interpretation which he places upon the Word of God, should be clearly defined in the confession of the Church to which he belongs, and to which also the preacher should give his unreserved acceptance. The fact is, a Church can not be scriptural, and it can not adhere to a definite plan of extending the Kingdom of

467346

God, unless it be confessional. It is subscription to the Augsburg Confession which makes a Lutheran Synod, or a Lutheran Church, or a Lutheran minister. There should be no misunderstanding among Lutheran bodies on that point.

Around that Augsburg Confession in the sixteenth century, there grew up a number of declarations and affirmations and apologies: The two Catechisms of Luther, the Apology of the Augsburg Confession, the Smalcald Articles, and the Formula of Concord. These in addition to the Augsburg Confession, have been adopted by some bodies as their confessional basis, but whether a body has accepted only the Augsburg Confession as its confessional basis and views the other writings of inestimable value, as does the General Synod, or whether a body accepts all of these writings as having confessional value, as does the General Council and other bodies, the fact remains that unreserved acceptance of the Augsburg Confession constitutes the making of a Lutheran body. With the Augsburg Confession, and the other writings which I have mentioned, of such unquestioned value, the Lutheran Church is built upon the most solid, the most substantial confessional basis which has ever been evolved, and from that foundation she will never be shaken. The mighty tides of the world around us may beat at our feet, and the clamor of a thousand thousand voices may ring in our ears, but we will stand firm on the old Augsburg rock.

I believe, Mr. President, in being a staunch and well-grounded denominationalist. I do not object to it in brethren of other communion, and certainly can reserve the same right for myself. Some years ago I attended a Presbyterian gathering and the speaker of the occasion was dwelling upon the largeness and the richness of the Presbyterian faith. In a moment of pardonable enthusiasm, as he was speaking of their doctrine of the majesty of the law and of the divine sovereignty, he exclaimed and affirmed that *Moses* was a Presbyterian. That did not disconcert me in the least. I knew that there was a Lutheran long before the time of *Moses*. It was Abraham, the man who was justified by faith, and I told the speaker so, after the meeting was over. What is needed in our day is not so much a loosening of the denominational girdles, but rather a tightening of the same, and a stricter adherence to those historical and doctrinal positions,

which make a denominational body distinctive. I am speaking only of our own branch of the Lutheran Church, when I say that we must not fail in the General Synod to develop a Lutheran *cultus*—a Lutheran type of faith, and worship, and style of living. Those features which inhere in Lutheranism should be faithfully preserved.

The order of public worship in all our churches should be the Lutheran order. The way of salvation and of sanctification, as taught in the Lutheran Church, should be faithfully followed. The Sacrament of Baptism with its washing of regeneration, should be bestowed upon the infant child. The spiritual life thus begun, should be carefully nurtured in the home and in the Church. At the age of understanding the child should be thoroughly instructed in the Catechism of the Church. At the time of confirmation, a sincere renewal and devotion to the Christian life should be made, and this should be followed ever afterwards by a careful and prayerful waiting upon the means of grace.

The Lutheran Church must not lose her conservatism. In a time when many new things are being tried, and liberalistic views are creeping into many denominations, it only becomes the more necessary for the Lutheran Church to stand firm in placing the emphasis upon the Word of God and the Sacraments. She must be positive in all her teaching and preaching. She must make bold proclamation of the precious Gospel—that Jesus Christ,—“The Son of God, took unto Him man’s nature, so that there are two natures, the Divine and the human, inseparably joined together in unity of person; one Christ, true God and true man; who was born of the Virgin Mary, truly suffered, was crucified, dead, and buried, that he might reconcile the Father unto us, and might be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for all actual sins of men.”

She must herald abroad, in the midst of all the looseness of these latter days, with a positive and a commanding note, that it is through “the instrumentality of the Word and Sacraments, as by instruments, the Holy Spirit is given, who, when and where, it pleases God, works faith in those who hear the Gospel, namely, that God for Christ’s sake, and not on account of any merit in us, justifies those who believe that they are received into favor

for Christ's sake." Strong insistence should be made that the Sacraments "were instituted not only as marks of Christian profession among men, but rather as signs and evidences of the will of God towards us, for the purpose of exciting and confirming the faith of those who use them," at a time when the Church is tempted to become socialistic in her methods of working, and thus try to reform society in the mass or in the lump. The Lutheran Church must not be drawn away from the primitive and apostolic method of applying the Gospel first to the heart of the individual. You cannot build a palace of marble out of red bricks, and you can not reconstruct society so that business will be carried on honestly, and government be administered justly, and society deport itself properly until first of all the regenerating and sanctifying power of the Word and the Spirit has moved in the hearts of men. Yes, the Lutheran Church must remain conservative in her doctrines and in her methods of working.

But conservatism does not mean sluggishness. It is compatible with the highest degree of energy and aggressiveness. The conservative man should work just as long and just as hard as the radical, or the liberal. The Lutheran Church must be conservative and aggressive. That is the position she must take, and continue to maintain in this great country of ours where the world's decisive battles are yet to be fought. She has a tremendous responsibility resting upon her, as her part in applying the principles of the Kingdom of God in this country. She is responsible for a large part of our vast and growing population. She must take a strong position. She can do nothing better than to adhere to her acknowledged symbols and writings, as the basis of her teaching and preaching, and then work with holy zeal and splendid energy. Such position will give to the Lutheran Church her largest leverage.

Perhaps there are young men here to-night who are almost ready to step out into this great work. Others of you are just beginning upon your academic and collegiate preparation. Some of you are just beginning your course of theological instruction. I want to congratulate you all. You were born in a good time. You can enter upon your work, as a Lutheran pastor and take your part in the leadership of the Church, in a

most auspicious time. You could wish for nothing better. There can be no richer opportunity than that which will present itself to young men in the service of the Lutheran Church in the next half century. Get ready for your work. There is a picture of Abraham Lincoln, stretched out with a book in his hand, before the fireplace at a late hour of night—beneath the picture are these words: "I will study and prepare myself; perhaps the time will come." The time did come. It always comes. It will come to you. It is coming fast. Be sure to give such diligence to your work of preparation, that when the work is thrust upon you, you will be ready for it. We must be hard and untiring workers in the service of Christ and His Church. We must work from the rising of the morning till the stars appear. Ours is a rich legacy and a solemn trust. Noble fathers have worked before us from the days of Martin Luther down to the present, in order that these large interests might be conserved. There is a divine and splendid apostolic succession in the Lutheran Church.

The Lutheran Church of this country has her heroes of the faith. This institution which is represented here to-night has had hard service to perform, but she has had many faithful workers. She has had her heroes of the faith also—men whose brains have throbbed, whose hearts have ached, whose souls have agonized. It was one of such who fell on the 11th day of last November. We can not, and we would not forget our loss. He was a master in the art of teaching. No pupil ever went out from his room with a confused notion as the fault of this teacher. He was superb in many of his endowments of mind and heart. He had the faith of a child. He has left a rich legacy of blessed memory and untold influence to the institution which he served so faithfully and the Church which he loved so well.

Professor Samuel F. Breckenridge, the teacher, the theologian, the churchman, the Christian, has joined the ranks of the faithful workers and fathers who have passed beyond. It is ever so. The servants of Christ are ever falling, but their work goes on.

It has been the will of your Board of Directors that this work should be entrusted to me. With a realization of the trust and

the responsibility which goes with it, I have accepted the work and shall endeavor to pursue it faithfully.

Perhaps I have indicated to you in a general way where I desire to place the emphasis. We will approach every page of the Old Testament with reverence, and study it from a positive standpoint. We will try to imbue the students with the joy of preaching.

We will also adhere to the Lutheran system of doctrine and practice.

We will stand for that larger and surer Lutheranism which is distinctive, historical, and Scriptural. That is the Lutheranism that will live. We will hope and pray for the closer affiliation and co-operation of all the Lutheran bodies of this country.

In all that we do we will seek only to enhance the glory of Christ, and the extension of his kingdom.

Springfield, Ohio.

ARTICLE VIII.

THE PLACE OF CHRIST IN AN ADEQUATE THEISTIC BELIEF.

BY JOHN A. M. ZIEGLER, PH.D., D.D.

To assert faith in God, and then to deny worship to Christ is illogical. That is, a theistic belief that does not include, also, belief in Christ is unsatisfactory. A conception of God that has no place for a gracious redemption, as, namely, the heathen view, is unworthy of Him who should be accounted The Almighty. To conceive of Him as gracious, as, indeed, redeeming His people, even as He is presented in the Old Testament Scriptures, and then, to refuse divine honors to Him in whom these Scriptures embody this gracious, redemptive purpose, as is done by modern Judaism and by Unitarianism, is self-contradictory.

The most illogical attempt, however, and at the same time one that merits no justification, is that of avowed evangelical preachers and teachers, who "having a form of godliness deny the power thereof." What is inaccurately denominated the New Theology, is an effort in the church and in Christian institutions to conserve a theistic belief, a belief that is, confessedly, the one revealed in the Scriptures, and at the same time to divorce this theism from the historical conception of Christian faith.

The specious plea in support of this contention is that monotheistic religionists throughout the world can unite on such a creed. Indeed, it is claimed that "new theology"—Jewish, Christian and Mohammedan—while recognizing the sublimity of Jesus' figure and his transcending position in the historical evolution of mankind, has decided to render divine worship to Him alone whom Jesus called Heavenly Father.

God speed the day, when devotees at monotheistic and at polytheistic shrines shall become one in an all-inclusive and satisfying faith. To attain this is the avowed intent of the Biblical propaganda, incompletely set forth in the Old Testament regime and unqualifiedly inculcated in the Christian system.

It were fool-hardy, however, if not suggestive of insincerity,

for a professing Christian to advocate such fraternity of belief, on any lower basis than the Biblical conception as our criterion of theism. To be consistent, we must not stop short of the ideal, the all-comprehensive faith that is the goal of all that is substantial in any religion, and that is responsible for the very exalted theistic view that is entertained throughout Christendom.

Our contention is that an adequate theistic belief, if intelligently entertained and practically appropriated, will include, also, belief in Jesus Christ, through whom and in whom alone such faith in God is possible.

Just here is the battle ground. In this controversy, some who are pledged to an evangelical faith are, to say the least, uncertain of their position. We purpose, briefly, to develop the theme: "The place of Christ in an Adequate Theistic Belief."

The doctrine of the Person of Jesus, as developed and defended by the Church of the Augsburg Confession, is the fundamental doctrine of a stalwart, Christian theology. It might be made the starting point for our discussion—laying a substantial foundation in our Biblical conception of the Divine—human Christ, including the relation between the two natures in the one person (*communicatio*), etc.—and thus accept the claim of evangelical theology respecting Him. This would be to lay the foundation in an intellectual conception, and from this rise to a fuller apprehension of the fatherhood and grace of God, as also, through an evangelical faith, to an appropriation of Jesus as a personal saviour.

Certainly, this would be a legitimate method—one that follows the beaten path of psychological procedure—and we cannot but have this inspiring conception of Jesus ever present to our thought, whatever method we adopt; yet, for evident reasons, we prefer the more subjective method, at least in our approach to the heart of the theme, allowing the splendid conception of the person of Jesus to follow as a legitimate and necessary conclusion.

Suppose we adopt the method of discovery—the *scientifico-historical* method, if you please. Let it begin in part by accident—unintentionally, at least; but let us pursue our investigation with intelligence and design.

Can we imagine ourselves as unacquainted with the Sacred

Scriptures? We have been absorbed in commercial enterprises or in investigations of science. Possibly, philosophy has been our pursuit—attempting to solve the riddle of the ages, but utterly ignoring the Bible as offering a satisfactory solution. We have lived under a Christian civilization, unconsciously absorbing much of its spirit and confessedly leading a strictly righteous life. But we do not know Christ—the Church and the Bible and things religious we have eliminated from our thought and consideration.

Certainly, no one can be such a dolt; but for the sake of the illustration we will place ourselves in that position as nearly as may be.

As Wesley was led to a consciousness of the assurance of faith through the reading of Luther's Preface, so are we brought to consider the claims of Jesus in a similar manner.

We fancy ourselves listening to an address on the life of Jesus—a simple portrayal of His words and deeds. There is no attempt at appeal. The story is told as an interesting record of a unique life. The narrator pauses only to ask for a satisfactory interpretation of the life he has portrayed—bidding us account for His incomparable personality, and suggesting the probability of some divinely planned purpose in that life, in which we may be interested.

As Luther was surprised and pleased at discovering the story of Hannah and Samuel, so we are attracted by what seems a unique portraiture of an ideal life.

As we might approach any new field of investigation that promises pleasing diversion and possible light, so we attempt for the first time to acquaint ourselves with the life of Jesus as it is recorded in the Gospels. We approach our task with somewhat of feverish interest, if not of amusement. The study of the Bible has been farthest from our thought; but, priding ourselves in our liberal-mindedness, and, withal, seeing no just reason for casting aside the impulse to investigate this, to us, newly interesting personage, we purchase a Bible and begin our task.

I speak advisedly, I am sure, when I affirm that several positive convictions will fasten themselves on us before we have proceeded far with our investigation. It must be taken for granted that we are honestly sincere in our attempt at investigation—

that we are willingly open to conviction. And if not, consciously so, yet if we are at least intellectually balanced and morally honest, the convictions to which I refer will assuredly come.

In the first place, we would be pronounced intellectually incapable and morally degenerate if, after a careful and comprehensive study of the conduct and teachings of Jesus, we should pronounce as our deliberate judgment that His life is defective and His moral and spiritual ideals are debasing. That is, our avowed attitude of liberal-mindedness will readily—and I may say, gladly—recognize in Jesus, as His personality is simply set forth in the Gospels, a character that is stainless—morally ideal. We will also just as certainly recognize the unimpeachable character of His teachings.

With this two-fold conviction: a spotless, manly life, and a masterful presentation of ideal, moral and spiritual truth, we are prepared for a further step in our investigation.

Here let us drop the simulation of unacquaintance with Christian truth, and proceed with our investigation in a direct, logical way.

Granting the claims thus far affirmed, we cannot escape the further trend of His teaching, that is, His emphasizing the attitude of God the Father as one of love to all men. And this love of God of which He speaks so freely is a forgiving love, that offers grace to sinners.

To discredit the character of God and His gracious purpose as set forth in the Gospels is to discredit our spiritual intelligence, and to brand ourselves with moral incapacity. It is conceded by all accredited truth seekers that this conception of God—the Christian conception of God, indeed,—is faultless. The savants of any monotheistic faith—including the most radical of the destructive, un-christianizing modernists—may be challenged to eliminate one characteristic of God as Biblically portrayed and not thereby belittle what they themselves set forth as the latest and the best portraiture of Deity.

It must be remembered that these prophets of a Christless theology, in their eagerness to be accounted the conservators—the reconstructors, rather—of a modern and rational faith, frequently read into Christian theology a perverse and oft-refuted conception; and then they proceed very sagely to hold up to

ridicule this fetisch of their own creation. What remains, after the elimination of their faulty interpretation of the orthodox position, is frequently nothing more than (if, indeed, measuring up to) the intelligent teaching of the evangelical pulpit of all ages.

This seeming digression serves the purpose of emphasizing the claim that the Christian view of God, fairly presented and expressed in terms of present day thinking, is acceptable to the intellectually honest and the spiritually minded.

Searching these Scriptures that He says testify of Himself, we discover much of the inspiration for His heart portraits of the Father. We discover, also, an unfolding revelation both of the character of God and of the divine, gracious plan for human salvation. Meditating on these co-ordinate revelations in the light of the Gospel interpretation, two other associated visions flash across our spiritual sight, dimly at first, but taking form as we become familiar with their import. They are these: Jesus came divinely commissioned to interpret the Old Testament message; and in Him is embodied the characteristics of love and grace that He ascribes to the Father.

Having gained this position, and with a mind sensitive to spiritual impressions—seeking to find God, if you please; not anxious, as modern, rationalistic criticism seems to be, to stifle the humanity-wide and history-long craving for a friendly voice of a revealing God—our search will advance us by strides and by bounds. We will not hesitate to admit that the picture of God that appeals to our admiration, our love and our allegiance, though set forth in the Old Testament, is made doubly appealing through the vitalizing and inseparable connection therewith of Jesus. That is, we are dependent on the life, the character and the teachings of Jesus for an appreciative interpretation of the Scripture representation of God.

This position is forfeited by an attempt to eliminate Christ from the Old Testament—or from the New, as the historic interpretation and fulfillment of the Old. Attempting this ungracious task—crucifying afresh the Saviour—Christ—with His annihilation goes also the Saviour—God, Jehovah; and we are reduced to the rationalistic or heathen view. We may have God, but He is Elohim, only; for there is no Jehovah, a God perso-

nally watchful for the prosperity of His people, except there be a gracious plan for redeeming His people, also, from the curse of their perverse rebellion. And this redemption plan centers in the Christ of the Old Testament and in Jesus of the New.

These deductions must be admitted by friend and foe alike, *else, why this frenzied attempt to discredit the revelation character of the Old Testament, and to divorce Jesus from His historic position as the divinely commissioned and embodied realization of this saving plan?*

The fact is, we are indebted to the historic Christ, in both Old Testament and the New, for our splendid, Christian conception of God. It is a fact, too, try as we may, we cannot draw a clear line of demarcation between God and Christ, in characteristics and in their service of love in the revealed plan of salvation.

In other words, when once Jehovah, our Saviour-God, as He is presented in the Scriptures and realized in Christ, is appreciated and appropriated in love, we will not fail to include Jesus in our worship. This is the import of His argument with the Jews in the fifth chapter of John. He says: "But ye have not the love of God in you." He plainly insinuates that if they loved Jehovah, as they claimed, they would also recognize Him as the embodied personation of the Father. Jesus had previously declared, verse 24: "He that heareth my word, and believeth on Him that sent me, hath everlasting life." The Jews prided themselves in being inheritors of everlasting life, and Jesus boldly challenges them to find any ground in Scripture for their claim, except their devotion to the God of their fathers is really a devotion of love; and such devotion, He claims, will include Himself, also, in their recognition.

Carrying the thought still farther, it is possible, only, to so love God, when we appreciate our need of just such a gracious Saviour-God—when, in our conscious inability, we recognize in the Christ-revealed Father, our hope of deliverance.

It is claimed that the contention in criticism is an intellectual and a literary dispute; but it is so largely in appearance, only. Underlying the seeming disinterested, scientific spirit, is an implication of moral dignity and of personal self-sufficiency. The argument against the evangelical interpretation is based on a

denial of human guilt and consequent need of redemption in the accepted sense of these realities. To claim belief in the almighty Father love, and then to refuse assent to the necessity and the effectiveness of the atonement, is a rejection of the corner-stone on which the significance of the Father-love rests.

The real argument for the legitimate place of Christ in a theistic belief is not entirely, nor mainly an intellectual one. To know God truly, is to know Him unto eternal life. It is to so appropriate His saving grace as to attain an assurance of salvation. Such knowledge includes of necessity a life yielded to Him in love and devoted to His service. This recognition of God in love culminates in worship. It is at the same time the assurance of eternal life and its realization in time.

But such a practical, saving knowledge of God is possible alone through the interpretative revelation of Christ. The Holy Scriptures alone of all the sacred writings of all ages give the data for the incomparable conception of God that dominates Christian thought; and Jesus represents—He stands for—as no other does in all the world's history, this gracious God and His revealed plan. He manifests in His own person and teachings what must be conceded as the very mind of God. We repeat: aside from Jesus as the Christ, we have no adequate revelation of God.

Moreover, Jesus himself repeatedly lays claim to this unique relation to the Scriptures and to the Father, including the divine plan of salvation. He says: "And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou has sent." Such a claim, if not founded in fact, is incompatible, to say the least, with the otherwise perfect character of Jesus and His supremely adequate and satisfying interpretation of the divine mind.

To be intellectually and morally honest, we must either concede to Jesus Christ the place of honor in our theistic belief and in our worship of love, or we must be content with a merely rationalistic and heathen view of God. There is no alternative—no legitimate middle ground.

Here, we repeat, is the battle ground. The contention has always been at this point. Rationalistic criticism today but accommodates the method of attack to the current spirit. Should

their conclusions prevail, (if indeed there is clearly defined and generally accepted belief among them), their's will be the responsibility for the dethronement of Jesus. They shall have the honor, too, of eliminating from current religious belief the element of gracious forgiveness. They cannot escape the logic of the argument, that an appreciative and appropriating knowledge of God, as a gracious Saviour, and an acceptance of Jesus Christ are inter-dependent and inseparable.

The calamity to religious thought and to spiritual experience, were evangelical Christianity to be abandoned, is emphasized in the following succinct statement of the argument: No Christ, no Father-God; no Father-God, no revealed salvation from sin; no salvation from sin, no need in human experience for forgiveness and grace—or, a hopeless anticipation of the outcome of earthly life.

We prefer—and reason and experience substantiate our preference—to hold fast to the Biblical expression of the divine character and of eternal verities, and in this preference intellectual and spiritual honesty places Jesus on the throne. He abides the beginning and the end of our faith.

A comprehensive discussion would require a fuller interpretation of the two substantial elements of the theme: The Person of Christ, and an Adequate Theistic Belief. Concerning the latter, we have been content merely to hint at what accredited theology or philosophy accounts "adequate." The terms: "Father," "Saviour-God," "gracious love," etc., sufficiently express, for the present discussion, what Christian theology demands of any worthy conception of God.

The captivating doctrine of "The Person of Christ," and the important place it holds in our Lutheran system of theology, needs no further reference than that already made. With Christ enthroned, an adequate theistic belief will embody in itself an adequate conception of the person of Christ. A comprehensive discussion of the one element will necessarily involve the other. When opportunity offers, this fuller discussion may be presented.

Adrian, Mo.

ARTICLE IX.

"CHRISTIAN WORSHIP: ITS PRINCIPLES AND FORMS."

By Rev. J. W. Richard, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Homiletics and Ecclesiastical Theology in the Theological Seminary at Gettysburg; and Rev. F. V. N. Painter, D.D., Professor of Modern Languages and Literature in Roanoke College. Second edition, revised. (Philadelphia: Lutheran Publication Society. [1908.] Pp. viii, 368. Price \$1.50).

BY PROFESSOR JOHN O. EVJEN, PH.D.

The first edition of this book appeared in 1892. A few minor changes and additions have been made in the revised edition, but in substance or sentiment the work remains the same. Fifteen years ago it was turned over to a coroner's inquest by a writer in *The Lutheran Church Review* (vol. xii, 208 f.). But the book has been living all the while, and is now entering upon a new lease of life. The verdict of that writer ran thus: "The most charitable judgment that can justly be formed concerning the book is that it was written before the authors had thoroughly mastered the subject. It contains a great amount of interesting information translated from various sources, without assimilation or satisfactory critical examination,—crude, verbose, confused... If the liturgical documents which Prof. Painter had translated with manifest care could have been published simply as such, or with explanatory notes, the book would commend itself more favorably to those few real students of liturgies whose previous preparation has been so limited that they are unable to read either Latin or German." The critic was especially displeased with the opening paragraphs of the book. They "are entirely rationalistic in their conception of the very idea of worship [viz. worship may be regarded as an instinct etc.].... We certainly commiserate the poor students who are to be drilled in this volume as a text-book, and the churches whose worship is to be regulated according to principles based on such premises."

Criticism of this kind may be left to perish of its own inherent spleen, though fairness requires to add that the alleged premises (we shall see later whether they are right or wrong) are no premises at all. They have no organic connection with the rest of the book, and should therefore not be used to prejudice the case either way. Moreover, the critic gets his authors mixed. For the Introduction, containing the objectionable "premises," cannot be, on stylistic grounds, the work of Prof. Richard, which the critic assumes since he fathers the translation of the documents upon Prof. Painter. Of course, the authors share joint responsibility, but the fact is that the hand of Prof. Richard is recognized in many of these translations made with manifest care.

It is going to the other extreme when a reviewer of the second edition, in *The Lutheran Observer*, Oct. 16, 1908, claims that no "Lutheran who cares to be informed on liturgical matters can afford to neglect this volume. Its authors speak with the authority of experts... There can be no higher testimony to the reliability of the facts and conclusions here set forth than that in this second edition, following the first of an interval of sixteen years, no revisions have been found necessary except the correction of several typographical errors, and few verbal changes and the addition of some historical matter to further fortify positions set forth." No doubt a compliment, but dubious. The liturgical literature in the Lutheran Church alone has in the last fifteen years acquired such dimensions, that our American Lutheran Seminaries are financially able to purchase only a small fraction of it, not to mention what individuals can do who know that, also financially, *ultra posse nemo obligatur*, and that the compass of the work to be written must be limited accordingly. A glance at the bibliography in *Theologischer Jahresbericht* will show what resources are necessary to justify a judgment as to the reliability of the facts, and, in consideration of the above, whether the paucity of changes in a new edition, got out sixteen years after the first draft, is a high testimony or a testimony at all.

The problem is not whether many or few changes have been found necessary; not whether the book be passed upon favorably by a friend of moderation in liturgics or it be given the death

sentence by a partisan of the high-church movement. The problem is, Does the book present scientifically established facts? It is not sufficient to dismiss a book with a few generalities, dealing out praise or censure in superlatives. A work like "*Christian Worship*" should be estimated at its own merits, independent of its controversial value.

The book has been assigned to me by Prof. Richard for a Review in *THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY*. Though I appreciate this honor, coming from one who is discounting American Lutheranism (for it is thoroughly provincial) and is pleading nobly for the Lutheranism of Europe with its cosmopolitan sweep and unrivalled scholarship, I enter upon my task under protest. The canons of criticism make no allowance for returning a courtesy. A practical exhibition of the contents and some divergent notes is all I can give.

Our authors are not high-churchmen. They are not low-churchmen. Their position is intermediate. When their book, in many places, seems to favor a minimum in liturgy, the explanation must be sought for in the time of its inception, when the high-liturgical tide threatened to flood the "English" portion of our Lutheran Church. To stem this tide it was necessary to vindicate the rational right of a minimum in liturgy, especially since the champions of the high-church movement, though not in theory, yet in practice, seemed to be annulling the adiaborous character of liturgy. No doubt the long use of a low-liturgy had prepared the way for the reactionary movement that reached the limit in the Common Service, which our authors are strongly opposed to. But this opposition to an unhistorical movement does not necessarily mean the championing of a barren liturgy. I know that one of the authors, Prof. Richard, looks with great favor upon the liturgy of Saxony. There is perhaps no other liturgy which would be so well suited to unite the various Lutheran congregations of our country, if union and unity be a question of liturgies.⁽¹⁾ That the Common Service cannot perform this function is evident to any one who knows the judgment passed upon it in Americo-Scandinavian circles. A compilation, so eclectic, and so alien to the criteria

(1) See note on Saxony, showing its fitness to lead, *LUTH. QUARTERLY*, April 1908, p. 250.

of historical method is a faux pas, defeating its own purpose, a purpose which, by itself, is entirely commendable and praiseworthy.

"Christian Worship" does not profess to be an exhaustive manual of liturgics as that of Rietschel's comprehensive "Lehrbuch." True to its title, it presents a general survey, as English Lutherans need, of the principles and forms of worship in different ages of the Church. It aims to furnish the historical setting for the various liturgic projections of the past. It translates entire documents, analyzes them and registers pertinent deductions. It is on the guard against the spirit of formalism. It is untiring in the emphasis of Christian liberty. After declaring what principles the Apostolic Age was guided by, it proceeds to show how these were correctly or incorrectly applied by the Greek and Roman Catholics and by the Churches of the Reformation. The development up to the Reformation is set forth tangibly by the translation of the liturgy of St. Clement, in the age of Constantine; of the liturgy of St. Chrysostom(2) in the Eastern Church: by a discussion of the Ambrosian and the Petrine class of liturgies in the Western Church to the year 600: by a verbatim reproduction of the Roman Catholic Missal. Accompanying summaries show the gist of these various liturgies and call attention to the steady growth of formalism in the Church at the expense of the preaching of the Word.

The renovation of true worship is shown to date from the Reformation. Luther's work is declared epochmaking in clearing the Church of cumbersome liturgical ballast. For Luther the chief thing in worship is the preaching of the Word. Our authors render a valuable service in translating the most important of his liturgical writings: Of the Order of Divine Worship in the Congregation, The Formula Missae, The German Mass. These are full of the spirit of evangelical liberty. No one since Paul had comprehended the entire compass of the adia-phora as did Martin Luther.

There now follows a chapter on Principles of Lutheran Worship. It discusses: (1) The objective principle formulated by Luther, "Where God's Word is not preached, it were better neither to sing, nor to read, nor to assemble." (2) The subjec-

(2) The liturgy bears his name, but he is not its author.

tive principle: faith, devotion, self-surrender of the congregation, which express themselves in prayer, praise, and thanksgiving. (3) The orderliness and decency of public assembly (here is discussed the time and place necessary to do justice to the foregoing principles); the expediency of the festivals of the Church year; the importance of Sunday assemblies; the significance of the altar; special forms of worship; books of devotion. (4) The adiaphorous character of ceremonies. (Luther himself would have put 3 and 4 under the same head.)

A separate chapter is given to the chief forms of worship in the Lutheran Church. A number of liturgies from the sixteenth century are mentioned or described. They are properly classified. There are (1) the Romanizing ones, like the Mark-Brandenburg; (2) the liturgies of north and central Germany—the liturgy in its most widely accepted form; (3) the simple liturgies of south and south-west Germany. It is to be regretted that the Scandinavian liturgies (that of Sweden is only mentioned) were not given some attention. Some of the German liturgies are analyzed, even translated. The Mecklenburg liturgy is given sixteen pages. Our authors, of course, reject the first class. Their preference is the second. And though they defend the third class, they do so, not for the purpose of making them acceptable candidates, but to show that they are Lutheran in origin, not Reformed. The simplicity of the southern liturgy follows quite naturally. Württemberg is a good Lutheran state, but it favors a short liturgy, builds churches without steeples, not because it is influenced by the Reformed, but because the magnificent spires and ornate liturgies of the Catholic neighbors are looked upon as vehicles of hierarchism. Thus, the association of ideas calls forth a protest which expresses itself even in the architecture and the cultus. Geographical factors are not without importance in moulding a cultus. Sweden, for instance, far away from Rome, preserved Romanizing customs that Switzerland or Württemberg, close to the papal see and intimately acquainted with its corruption, found shocking. The Lutherans in the western part of our country, being for the most part from the northern and central part of Germany and from Scandinavia, should naturally show more appreciation of a rich liturgy than the Lutherans in the East, where the earlier emi-

grants from western and southern Germany settled. To a stranger it remains inexplicable that the Lutheran East has given birth to a liturgy which in its high-church trend surpasses anything used in the Lutheran West.

More than one-third of our book treats of worship in the Lutheran Church. Thirty pages are given to worship in the Reformed Church. More attention perhaps should have been given to the Book of Common Prayer. Its eclectic character is pointed out. While it is admitted that much is beautiful and edifying in the Anglican liturgy, its defects are only briefly noted, and its Reformed type merely indicated. I cannot agree with our authors in saying that the liturgies of Calvin and Knox are "simple, Scriptural and beautiful." One is tempted to ask in what sense they were simple, and whether the Scripturalness did not consist in the letter rather than in the spirit. Knox was a radical in his reformation of worship. He did away with all days of public worship except Sunday, he rejected Christmas as a despicable invention of the Papists. The organ, the altar, the cross, the candle—everything symbolical was an offense to the Scotch iconoclast. Also the Frenchman was opposed to altars, crucifixes, images, and candles as violations of the divine law in the decalogue. The churches were turned into naked auditoria, the table took the place of the altar, kneeling was condemned, broken bread was substituted for the oblate,⁽³⁾ and the liturgy was reduced to prayer, no longer to be sung but to be spoken. One fails to see the beautiful in this. As for the Scripturalness, Calvin and Knox transformed the Catholic **MUST** into the Reformed **MUST NOT**—which amounts to one and the same thing, both violating the law of Christian liberty. How different was Luther, and his teaching concerning the *adiaphora*.

The last portion of our book, except two chapters by Prof. Valentine, deceased, discusses recent liturgical movements and tendencies. It shows that the tendency of the Presbyterians lies in the direction of a moderate liturgy, but also that for all Pro-

(3) More than 98 per cent. of the Lutherans in the world retain the oblate. The use of broken bread or of oblates is an *adiaphoron*. The oblate is preferable. It is a miniature likeness of the thin, round, unleavened cake, used at the Paschal Meal when the Lord's Supper was instituted.

testant Churches the days for elaborate liturgies belong to the past. This cannot be denied. Everywhere in Lutheran Germany and Scandinavia the liturgies are being changed: simplified or built up according to sound principles derived from a thoroughgoing liturgical study, as was impossible a generation ago. Norway is making her liturgy more elaborate, but is not going beyond the normal. A consensus as to what is historical and ecclesiastically proper is being formed everywhere. No longer will it be deemed a sufficient guarantee for adopting rubrics from Löhe or Kliefoth that these prescribed them. The liturgist of to-day applies other criteria. A model in many respects is the Prussian Agenda. Its elasticity is remarkable.

Very welcome and very elucidating is the analysis of the Common Service. Our authors do not object to it as originally proposed (18 parts) by the Joint Committee of the General Bodies, nor to the modified form (23 parts) approved by the same Bodies. They object to it as completed and published by the Committee, who "apparently upon their own authority" made new additions, so that the final draft has thirty-four parts.

The parts are: 1. Hymn of Invocation. 2. "In the name of the Father," etc. 3. Confession of Sins, consisting of exhortation, adjutorium, versicle ("I said I will confess," etc.), confession, confessional prayer, and declaration of grace or absolution. 4. Introit. 5. Gloria Patri. 6. Kyrie. 7. Gloria in Excelsis. 8. Salutation ("The Lord be with you," and response). 9. Collect. 10. Epistle. 11. Hallelujah, to which may be added a Psalm or hymn. 12. Gospel announced, followed by "Glory be to Thee, O Lord." 13. Gospel read, followed by "Praise be to Thee, O Christ." 14. Creed. 15. Hymn. 16. Sermon. 17. Votum ("The peace of God," etc.) 18. Offertory. 19. General Prayer. 20. Lord's Prayer. 21 Hymn. 22. Salutation ("The Lord be with you," and response.) 23. Sursum Corda ("Lift up your hearts," etc.) 24. Preface. 25. Sanctus. 26. Exhortation. 27. The Lord's Prayer and Words of Institution. 28. Pax Vobiscum. 29. Agnus Dei. 30. Distribution. 31. Nunc Dimittis. 32. Thanksgiving Collect. 33. Benedicamus. 34. Benediction

The eleven added parts are: 3 (in part), 8 and 22, 12, 13, 17, 18, 23, 28, 31, 33. Let us examine only these.

Part 3, where the minister says, "I said, I will confess my transgressions unto the Lord," and the congregation makes the response, "And Thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin" [Psalm 32] should be stricken. It is without precedent in Lutheran liturgy. It serves no real purpose, is therefore not beautiful. The remark of Prof. Hauck on church architecture will also apply on liturgy: *es giebt keine zweckwidrige Schönheit, sondern alles Zweckwidrige ist unschön.*

Part 8 (and 22) may remain. Luther retains it in the Formula Missae, but not in the German Mass. Its proper place is before the Collect, and at the beginning of the second part of the service, Communion. Saxony uses it twice; Prussia once, before the Collect.

Part 12, like 3, is without warrantable precedent, *zweckwidrig*, and an offense to good taste. It borders on the ridiculous, that, immediately following the minister's announcement *where* (what book, chapter, etc.) the Gospel for the day is found, and before he can begin to read it, the congregation "shall say or sing 'Glory be to God.'" Glory for what? Glory, because it has been written, say, in Mark 7 and not in Matthew 9? The Gloria comes too early. It is liturgically correct when it is said by the minister *after* the reading of the Gospel. Thus in Saxony and Prussia. The Common Service has here followed the Roman Mass (Rietschel, Liturgik I, 368).

Part 13 may remain. It can be the response to the minister's words in 12 (corrected) or a response to the reading of the Gospel, when 12 is omitted.

Parts 17 and 18 should be stricken. They break the unity in the service. Saxony and Prussia have neither. If an offertory is to be used, it should form a part of the communion service.

Part 23 is retained in Prussia, but not in Saxony. Luther rejected it.

Part 28 should be omitted altogether, or come in at the beginning of the service (PRE xi, 557).

Part 31 should be stricken (Prussia, Saxony). It belongs to Vespers.

Part 33, as a thanksgiving Collect precedes, should be omitted (Saxony, Prussia), otherwise we have tautology.

With reason, do our authors object to the Common Service; that is evident to any one who studies it with Rietschel or any other European expert as guide. It is fair to see the cosmopolitic side of the case. If our liturgic mist is dispelled we need no longer be disturbed by such confident proclamations as the following: "It will thus be seen, that the Lutheran Order of Service [Common Service] most perfectly embodies and applies all the fundamental principles pertaining to Divine Service contained in Holy Scriptures, and that each part is in its proper place. And whoever intelligently and devoutly joins in every part of this service will experience that it contains everything necessary to our edification and growth in grace. Any man that cannot profitably unite in such worship must be sadly wanting either in Christian intelligence or devotion, or both. By its diligent and faithful use all may 'come to the fulness of stature of new men in Christ Jesus.'" (4)

Our authors have not attempted a consideration of the merits or demerits of the Common Service, but briefly stated the leading historic facts, which have been frequently lost sight of. Besides the objections noted, the following must be made. (1) The Common Service provides for only one series of Pericopes, while the leading Lutheran churches have three or four. (2) The table of Scripture lessons for Sundays and festivals of the church year stands in need of revision; the table of lessons for morning and evening throughout the year not only needs revision but, in view of all our modern Bible helps, is nothing short of anachronism. (3) The substitution of responsive *reading* for responsive *singing* is Reformed. There is nothing in the Common Service so foreign to Lutheran liturgic practice as the rubrics which contain the words "sung or said." It is an innovation, a step backward.

The motive behind the "Service" was justifiable: a richer Lutheran liturgy. But there is a medium between the overloaded finery of the Common Service and the homely patchwork called Order of Public Worship for the General Synod (Book of Worship 9-18). Both make it evident that we need cultivate our

(4) Memoirs of the Lutheran Liturgical Association V. 67 (cfr. VI. 1-15).

liturgic sense. A beginning was made by the Lutheran Liturgical Association. It is to be hoped that this Association will resume its activity, though with this modification: that the spirit of antiquarianism be made less prominent and that the historic spirit receive full recognition. In no way could the Association render a better service than by giving us Rietschel's large work in English dress. Rietschel's "*Lehrbuch*" is a technical work, and that "*Christian Worship*" does not claim to be. The latter, whatever other merits it possesses, has the one of being easily understood also by intelligent laymen. It should prove to be an apt text-book not only for the theological student for whom it is intended, but also for the general reader. It does not lie beyond the comprehension of a good class in Y. M. C. A. work, or of an adult class in Sunday School. A minister could put it to excellent use even if he should differ with the authors on some points.

Here I should break off, but I cannot dismiss the opportunity, which a review gives, of enlarging on a few points and at the same time registering my dissent where I consider the authors' position untenable.

The most important are the following:

1. The first paragraph of the Introduction discussing the origin of Worship is, in the main, untenable. It reads: "Worship may be regarded as an instinct. It is the result of man's natural endowments and of his surroundings. It is not the invention of the priesthood or the product of material evolution. Man has a spiritual nature; that is, the power to conceive of a Deity and a supernatural world, and the capacity to adore, love and trust. In the course of his mental development these powers start spontaneously into action. By several different paths the mind is led to the idea of God. Behind the mutable objects of nature, the understanding seeks and finds an unchanging ground; and in the presence of obvious design, it recognizes an intelligent Creator. Conscious of its weakness in the midst of mighty and mysterious forces, the heart seeks refuge and rest in an over-ruling and loving Father. . . Worship is . . . seen to originate in the nature and needs of the human soul. Christianity encourages, guides, elevates and sanctifies human worship."

The line of argumentation followed in the above is not un-

common in older treatises on Theism or Dogmatics. A writer on Theism like Fisher, of Yale, could speak of a native belief arising spontaneously in connection with the feeling of dependence. And with Dorner, the dogmatician, he could fall back on the ontological, cosmological, teleological, moral, and historical arguments for the being of God. These arguments are no longer credited. Since Kant's day—he showed their weakness—much has been written concerning them, both pro and con. We teach to-day that God is so great and his independence so absolute that his existence cannot be proved by human logic or inference. If God had not chosen to reveal himself, we should have known nothing about him. The existence of a world can, at the best, only postulate an architect, not a Creator, not a loving merciful Father. The first condition for knowing that God exists is Revelation, a gift to us from Above. Revelation given, the so-called proofs for the being of God have their value. Otherwise they prove nothing, demonstrate nothing. This is the view of the present-day philosopher and theologian. A philosopher, so friendly to the Christian world-view as Külpe, can say concerning these arguments that, taken separately or collectively, they do not prove the existence of God. The same standpoint is taken by Julius Köstlin, O. Kirn, and R. Seeberg. Says Seeberg: "There is no innate natural religion just as there are no innate ideas." Seeberg also rejects the theory that religion, of necessity, follows from the nature of the mind or spirit. Of itself the spirit of man cannot conceive the idea of God. Revelation is necessary. But Revelation comes to man as a gift from God, and therewith he receives the idea of God and the idea of religion. There is a predisposition in man to receive these ideas. But he cannot conceive them. "Aus den verschlungenen Hieroglyphen der Welterscheinungen lässt sich der Gottesgedanke nicht entziffern. Dann muss er dem Menschen von aussen her gegeben sein..."(5) Says Kirn, after he has declared the ontological proof a logical fallacy, and the historical an assumption: "Die übrigen Bewiese haben nur so fern Wert als sie auf Probleme hinweisen, die nur auf dem Boden des Gottesglauben endgült-

(5) R. Seeberg, *Die Grundwahrheiten der Christlichen Religion*, 4 ed. 1906, p. 7.

tig gelöst werden können. Dagegen vermögen sie nicht instetiger Schlussfolgerung und mit zwingender Notwendigkeit diese Lösung selbst an die Hand zu geben. Sie bedürfen darum alle der Ergänzung durch den *Selbstbeweis Gottes in seiner Offenbarung* und dienen dem Christen nicht so wohl zur *Begründung*, als vielmehr zur *Durchführung* des schon auf anderem Weg begründeten Gottesglaubens gegenüber dem Stoff der Welterkenntnis." (6) Köstlin agrees. Anyone reading his article "Gott" in PRE will see that the old position has been given up for one which cannot be shaken.

As before stated, our authors' theory of the origin of worship does not affect the corpus of the book, forms no premise. It concerns Dogmatics, not Liturgics.

2. Our author's view of the Pericopes and of the Church year seems to favor the Reformed rather than the Lutherans. But this is, perhaps, only apparent. It is true that they say: "The attempt to keep up an ecclesiastical year alongside of the civil year, will probably be found to savor of the spirit of formalism." Coming from Lutherans, this statement may be startling. But the meaning must be that the ecclesiastical year beginning with Advent is unhistorical. And so it is. Recent research has proved that in the Middle Ages there was no difference between the civil and the ecclesiastical year. (7) Luther began the latter with Christmas. The Pericope collections have always been weak in the selection of texts for the weeks between the last Sunday in Trinity and Christmas. To date the beginning of the Church year with Christmas is logically correct and conforms entirely to the practice observed by the Lutherans in the sixteenth century. (8)

As to the Pericopes our book is correct in maintaining that those in ordinary use, the old series, have their faults. It would not be justifiable, however, to conclude from this that free texts are better than Pericopes. When it is claimed that the Homiliary of Charlemagne "fostered an indolent, ignorant and incompetent clergy," "did some good, much harm," we say with F.

(6) O. Kirn, *Grundriss der ev. Dogmatik*, 2 ed. 1907, p. 46.

(7) Rietschel I, 216.

(8) Den Postillen und Evangelienauslegungen des 16. Jahrh. liegt der Gedanke des "Kirchenjahres" fast durchgängig ganz fern. I. c. 219.

Wiegand (quoted in Hauck's *Kirchengeschichte* [II, 246] as antiquating E. Ranke's ideas) that we know too little about the influence of the Homiliarium on preaching to determine anything as to the harm done (PRE viii, 310.) When Luther criticised the Pericopes on the ground that they unduly magnify works to the obscurity of faith, he had in mind their use as lessons, not as texts to preach on. His own postil largely follows the order of the gospels in the Homiliarium. He was conservative on the use of the Pericopes as texts, though his utterances varied. At times he could favor the *lectio continua*. But he retained the old text for Sundays. In the afternoon and on week-days texts from the Old Testament were preached upon. This gave the Word free course. A modern church goer who has to hear a Pericope preached upon for the thirtieth time will feel the deadly monotony of repetition. But the modern arrangement of using three or four different series of texts settles the problem, insures for the Lutheran Church the continuation of wisely prescribed texts over against the shibboleth of the Reformed: unrestricted choice of texts. Württemberg has three series, having added the second in 1830, the third in 1894. Lutheran Bavaria has three; in the sixties she received permission to use, every other year, free texts or the first series of Pericopes in Thomasius; in 1897 the use of the second series in Thomasius was granted. Saxony has four, the fourth series gives a list of three new texts for each Sunday, one of which must be chosen. The "Eisenacher Konferenz" has published its own Pericopes. Many churches, especially in Prussia, use them. Sweden has three series, since 1862. Denmark two, since 1885. Norway three, since 1886. The various collections are judicious and show much agreement. The tendency in all Lutheran churches (the General Synod, or rather a part of it, forms an exception) is to abide by the Pericope system in some form or other. This may seem a restriction upon the Word, but unlimited freedom is often no freedom. An assembly believing in free speech finds it necessary to restrict by adopting Parliamentary rules. The International Sunday School Lesson or the Christian Endeavor Topic is really an endorsement of the Pericope principle. Those who are intimately acquainted with the working both of the "free text" and of the Pericope knows that the prescribed text

seldom fetters the pulpit. The fetter is apt to be on the other side. A mediocre homilete wedded to the text of his own choice—too often only five or six words—and preaching a sermon that may be appended to a score of other texts is the one who forges the fetter. The fixed Pericope would force such a preacher to face the homiletic legacy of the past as contained in such valuable collections as the postils of Luther, Hofacker, Löhe, or the homilies of Pank, Kögel, Frommel. What a gain, if those who conjure with the "Homiletic Review" would sit down to study the scientific Homiletics of men like Hering, Kleinert, and Steinmeyer. There is elasticity in the use of the Pericope system also. The ironclad rule that binds a man down to a prescribed text, when this is ill-suited for the occasion, does not exist. Many of the Lutheran churches in the West have prescribed texts at Sunday morning services, leaving the use of them in the evening entirely optional. The Pericope system is also the best guarantee for an intelligent observance of the Church Festivals. Where these have been done away with, it has meant "ein Stoss ins Herz des kirchlichen Lebens." (9)

3. In a book on Christian Worship allotting so much space to Lutherana we should expect unequivocal terminology where the Lord's day is referred to. *Nemo vir prudens de . . . vocabulo magnopere rixabitur*, but we recommend for consideration the advice of Prof. Gregory, who, being an American by birth, a Presbyterian by training, a Leipzig professor of theology by choice, says: "We must quit the pernicious habit of calling the Lord's Day by the Jewish name for Saturday [i. e. Sabbath]." Our authors' conception of the third commandment, moreover, belongs to the seventeenth century, not to the sixteenth. This conception—peculiar to the English portion of the Lutheran Church—is not very complimentary to "foreigners." We advise the attentive perusal of Frank, *System der Christlichen Sittlichkeit*, 1887, II, 233 ff.; of Kirn, *Grundriss der Theologischen Ethik*, 1906, 45 f.; of Kübel, *Christliche Ethik*, 1896, II, 321 ff.; of Th. Kaftan, *Auslegung des lutherischen Katechismus*, 1906, 73 ff.; of Julius Köstlin, *Christliche Ethik*, 1899, 677 ff.; of Luthardt, *Theologische Ethik*, 1898, 288 ff.; of Zahn, *Skizzen aus*

(9) W. Caspari. PRE. Art. Perikopen 156.

dem Leben der Alten Kirche, 1898, 160 ff. (Geschichte des Sonntags vornemlich in der alten Kirche. Perhaps the ablest treatise written on the subject. An appendix gives important notes); Zöckler, PRE, Art. Sonntagsfeier; Rietschel, Lehrbuch der Liturgik, 1900, I, 154 ff.

4. Most commendable is our book in the repeated emphasis it lays on the idea of Luther, that in all public worship the most important is the *preaching of the Word*, and that the Christian Congregation should never assemble except the Word of God be preached. The main thing, then, is not the reading of the Word, but the sermon, the *preaching of the Word*.

Not all hold this view. One writer says: "According to the Lutheran conception, the sacramental is the main element. Not the prayers and chants and hymns of the people or even the word of the pastor, testifying from the depth of his Christian experience, but the Word of God is itself the chief part of every service. The reading and repeating of this Word have a sacramental force.(10)...The sermon is supplementary and subordinate to the reading of Holy Scriptures."(11) The writer has followed the dogmatists of the seventeenth century; not the teachers of the sixteenth. That is evident to any one who reads R. H. Grützmaker's lecture, "Luthers vorbildliche Stellung zu Wort und Geist."(12) Grützmaker is a leading authority on this question, having made extensive investigations entitling him to be heard.

But first, let us ask: When does the preacher preach the Word? Not, when he reads his text to follow it with a "sermon" consisting of little rambles in modern literature, politics, ethics; or of commonplaces on the goodness of God and the virtue of man such as could be furnished by Socrates, Plato or the Stoics. None of these things nor a mixture of some or all of

(10) H. E. Jacobs, in "Christian Worship," New York, 1897, 156 f.

(11) Ibid, 167.

(12) "Luther ist in ihr [i. e. Formulierung] weit glücklicher als die spätere altorthodoxe Dogmatik, die sich mit unserem Problem nach einem Streite um 1620 sehr eingehend beschäftigte. Sie kam dabei zu einer vollen Verschmelzung von Wort und Geist, und wickelte den Geist so ein ins Wort, dass man seine lebendige persönliche Art darüber vergessen musste: ja sie behauptete, der Geist sässe im Worte, auch wenn es nicht gebraucht würde, extra usum." (Grützmaker, Modern-Positive Vorträge, 1906), 145.

them, flavored with a few references to Scripture(13) constitutes the preaching of the Word. But a positive answer is demanded. It can be given when we have answered the second question: What is the Word? Luther throws light on this question in his explanation of the third commandment: "We should fear and love God 'dass wir die Predigt und sein Wort nicht verachten..'" According to Th. Kaftan the "und" here means "namely." He says: Not two separate things, the preaching and the Word, are specified; only one thing, the Word as it lives in preaching. The Word is also present in reading, in singing, in blessing, in prayer, and in the sacraments.(14) The same idea is brought out in Grützmaker's lecture: To the Word as means of grace belongs, according to Luther, every announcement of salvation in Christ irrespective in what form or through what person it comes. "A mother teaching her child to pray...should know that, through her, God himself becomes active for the eternal salvation of her child. Every professor who makes it his concern to show his students the greatness of Christ, even if it be through learned dogmatic formulas, 'vermag in diesem Thun ein Leiter für ewige Funken zu sein.' And especially can the minister say concerning his sermon what Luther himself puts into his mouth: Haec dixit dominus...Parallel to the grand freedom with which Luther defines the compass of the Word we have an equally grand stringency in his determination of the content: It must be able to bring us grace and salvation."(15) The soul of the sermon is thus grace and salvation. And preaching, which is an individualizing of the Word, is therefore of supreme importance. The effective Word is substantially identical with Revelation. This substantial identity does not depend on the sermon's having Bible quotations, but on its saturation with Biblical matter and Biblical thoughts. The Word *muss Christus*

(13) "Die wohl von dem einen oder anderen früher geteilte Meinung, als hänge die Wirkung der Predigt an den von ihr gebrachten Bibelversen oder die eines Buches an der Masse der in ihm aufgespeicherten Bibelzitate kann sich auf Luther nicht berufen. Er sagt vielmehr deutlich: 'Nec est necesse, eloquia domini tantum ea intelligi, quae de scripturis in vocem assumuntur, sed quaecunque deus per hominem loquitur sive idiotam sive eruditum, etiam *citra scriptura usum*, sicut in Apostolis locutus est et adhuc loquitur in suis.'" (ibid. 137).

(14) Th. Kaftan, *Auslegung des luth. Katechismus*, 80.

(15) Grützmaker, 137.

treiben. With keen psychological insight and a highly developed sense for the real, Luther has observed that the Word as spoken and heard in Christian assembly is far more effective than when read at home. (16) The reading of a sermon at home is accordingly an inadequate substitute for the same sermon heard in church.

Is there, then, anything more important in a church service than the preaching of the Word? Is not the celebration of the Lord's Supper more important? Luther did not answer this question. His original idea was to have one service, where the Word was preached, and one where the Lord's Supper was celebrated. (17) But since he considered preaching essential, he surrendered the original idea in making room for the sermon in his "German Mass." Thus, preaching and communion were united in one service. This became the practice in the Lutheran Churches of the sixteenth century with the exception of only a few. It has maintained itself to our day. Most of the Agendas provide for the communion to follow the preaching, even though the majority of the assembled hearers leave the Church before the second part is begun. In theory, then, the communion service is a continuation of the service of the Word; in practice there is a distinct division. In Scandinavia, communion takes place in the presence of the whole congregation, though as a rule only a part of it commune. Gustav Jensen, Norway's foremost liturgist, says that the majority of the leading liturgists of to-day advocate the holding of two separate services, one for the Word, and one for the Sacrament of the altar. (18) Rietschel, too, favors the separation. (19) The apostolic and post-apostolic age had the two kinds of services, one for the Word, one for the Sac-

(16) "Oder wo sie das Wort schon daheim lesen, so ist's doch nicht so fruchtbar noch so kräftig, als kräftig das Wort ist durch die öffentliche Predigt und den Mund des Predigers, die Gott dazu berufen und geordnet hat, dass er's dir predigen und sagen soll." (Quoted by Grützmacher, 137).

(17) Rietschel 1, 495.

(18) G. Jensen, *Art. Gudstjeneste in Kirkeleksikon for Norden*, 1904, II, 298.

(19) "Diese tief eingewurzelte Auffassung von der unbedingten zeitlichen Zusammengehörigkeit des Wort- und Sakramentsgottesdienstes und der Unvollständigkeit und Nichtberechtigung des Wortgottesdienstes als Hauptgottesdienst am Sonntag ist weder *geschichtlich*, noch *theoretisch*, noch *praktisch* begründet. (Rietschel, I, 497).

rament. If this early custom could be revived, we should hear nothing more concerning the relative importance of the preaching of the Word and the celebration of the Sacrament. There would then be no occasion to say, as sacramentarians do, that worship reaches its zenith in the Sacrament. It would be made plain that the two services differ in form. In the one we have the verbum audibile, in the the other the verbum visibile. But "idem effectus est verbi et ritus," as our Confessions teach. A comparison is therefore impossible. Notwithstanding, theories abound and new questions arise only to show the relativeness of our knowledge and the inadequacy of human thinking and human language to grasp divine mystery and set it forth in tangible formulas with mathematical precision.

With this we close. We wish "Christian Worship" on its second journey a hearty Godspeed.

Gettysburg, Pa.

ARTICLE X.

RELATION OF THE GENERAL SYNOD TO THE LUTHERAN CHURCH.

BY J. M. REIMENSNYDER, D.D.

The Church is a growth and a development. As an institution in the world among men it has a history. Religion and worship are as old as the human race. The study of ancient history is largely the study of gods and religion. We know no time in history without an altar and a sacrifice, and no nation without gods, shrines or a temple. At first the father or eldest member of the household was the priest or judge, the family was the unit and the government patriarchial. When true religion had failed under Adam and Noah, God called Abraham from his native city and people to found a people whose central idea should be true religion and worship of the only one true God, Maker of heaven and earth. From Him sprang the nation and the Church, in the order of the altar, tabernacle, or tent of meeting, the temple, synagogue and finally the modern Church. Religion has one connected history thus for nearly four thousand years. At first worship was exceedingly simple. It however always had the outward sign and the inner life. Circumcision and faith were the beginning, with obedience to God as underlying both. This was the foundation period. Passing from Abraham to David, Solomon and thence to the Jewish people and to Christ, we have in the Christian Era, the simplicity of the Apostolic Church. Here the conditions of membership were exceeding simple. Peter declared them on the great day of the Feast of Pentecost to be repentance and conversion. On the great question of Gentile discipleship, the Apostolic see simply required abstinence from things sacrificed to idols, and from blood and from things strangled, and from fornication, closing with the words, "From which if ye keep yourselves it shall be well with you, fare ye well." Jude, in his epistle to them that are called and beloved, speaks of our common salvation and asks that they contend earnestly for that faith which was once for all

delivered unto the saints. Jesus said, "If any man would come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me." Paul wrote to the Romans, "We reckon therefore that a man is justified by faith." This was the character of the early Christian Church. The Bible has not departed from this simplicity. The ignorance, superstition and deceptions of the evil one and the vanities of the world, have perhaps made enlargement and formulation of doctrines and creeds necessary. The Church has had one origin and one history. The Church under the Roman see added burdens and clouded the truth in the Sixteenth Century until the Reformation under God became a necessity and out of it grew the Lutheran Church. The Augsburg Confession presented at the city which gave it its name, became a creed of Christendom and the specific Creed of the Lutheran Church. Its cardinal points were justification by faith and not by works, the Bible as the Word of God the only unerring rule of faith and practice or life, the parity (equality) of the ministry, the right of the exercise of private judgment according to the Word of God and the conscience, and that God alone can forgive sins. This was a return to the simplicity of the faith of the Apostolic Church. Kurtz's Church History says: "The Christian Church is that divine institution for the salvation of man, which Jesus Christ has founded on the earth. Its aim is to have the salvation wrought out by Christ communicated to, and freely appropriated by, every nation and individual. Outwardly, the Church manifests itself in the religious fellowship of those who having become partakers of this salvation, co-operate in their own places and according to the measure of their gifts and calling towards the extension and development of the kingdom of God." Mosheim's Church History says: "The rise of this Church (The Lutheran) must be dated from that remarkable period, when Pope Leo X. drove Martin Luther, with his friends and followers, from the bosom of the Roman hierarchy, by a solemn and violent sentence of excommunication. It began to acquire a regular form and a considerable degree of stability and consistence from the year 1530 (June 25th, 1530) when the system and morality which it had adopted was drawn up and presented to the diet at Augsburg." "The great and leading principle of the Lutheran Church, is, that the Scrip-

tures are the only source from which we are to draw our religious sentiments whether they relate to faith or practice, and that these inspired writings are in all matters that are essential to salvation, so plain and easy to be thoroughly understood that their significance may be learned without the aid of an expositor by every person of common sense, who has a competent knowledge of the language in which they are composed. There are indeed certain formularies adopted by this Church, which contain the principal points of its doctrine, ranged for the sake of method and prespicuity in their natural order. But these books have no authority but what they derive from the Scriptures of truth, whose sense and meaning they are designed to convey; nor are the Lutheran doctors permitted to interpret or explain these books so as to draw from them any propositions inconsistent with the express declarations of the Word of God." Wolf in the Lutherans in America: "God's Providence and the preaching of the pure gospel of salvation brought into being the Evangelical Lutheran Church." (Charles P. Krauth in his translation of the Augsburg Confession—Introduction): "*The Confession (Augsburg Confession) exhibited the one, undivided faith of the entire Lutheran Church in the Empire.*" "*As various kingdoms, states and cities embrace the faith of God's Word, as our Church had unfolded it, they accepted this Confession as their own and were known as Evangelical Lutherans, because they accepted it. The Church was known as the Church of the Augsburg Confession.*" "*It is called a Confession, not a rule. The Bible is the only rule of faith, and this document confesses the faith of which the Bible is the rule.*" *Minutes of the General Council, 1907 Fortieth Anniversary, Buffalo, N. Y.* "*President's Report, Doctrinal and Historical Address, Theodore E. Schmauk, D.D.*" "*The Lutheran Church is as broad as the world.*" "*The absolute directory of the will of Christ is the Word of God, the Canonical Scriptures, by which Scriptures the Church is to be guided in every decision. She may set forth no article of faith which is not taught by the very letter of God's Word, or derived by just and necessary inference from it.*" *Minutes of the General Council, 1907, Theses on the Holy Scriptures:*

First. "Our Lutheran Church believes, confesses and teaches

that the prophetic and apostolic writings of the Old and New Testaments are the only rule and standard according to which all doctrines and teachers are to be judged and proved (F. C. I.) and the most clear and pure fount of Israel (F. C. II.)”

Second. “Therefore all doctrine must not only be drawn from the Holy Scriptures, but must agree with it in every particular. The authority of any doctrine depends upon its being a truth given by divine revelation.”

This is unquestionably the basis of true Lutheranism, both historically and doctrinally as confessed and acknowledged by all parties and writers in the Lutheran Church. This is her faith in history. Now what relation does the General Synod sustain to the Lutheran Church according to this testimony? The General Synod was organized October 22, 1820, at Hagerstown, Md. It was the first and mother general body of the Lutheran Church in this country. Dr. S. S. Schmucker in his “Church of the Redeemer,” says concerning the General Synod: “Some were also displeased at our early recognition of the Augsburg Confession, for the Pennsylvania Synod, the oldest Lutheran Synod in this country, had not pledged its members to any other symbol but the Bible for twenty years before, and as long after the organization of the General Synod.” Dr. Morris in his “Fifty Years in the Lutheran Ministry,” says of Dr. S. S. Schmucker: “He filled a larger space in the public eye outside of the Lutheran Church, than any other man in it.” He was one of the original founders of the Theological Seminary (Gettysburg) and its first professor. He wrote nearly all the constitutions of Synods, seminaries and other institutions, which were required at that early day. Hence a man of authority.

Constitution of the General Synod, Section 3: “All regularly constituted Lutheran Synods, not now in connection with the General Synod, receiving and holding with the Evangelical Lutheran Church of our fathers, the Word of God, as contained in the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the only infallible (unerring) rule of faith and practice, and the Augsburg Confession as a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the divine Word and of the faith of our Church founded upon that Word, may at any time become associated with the General Synod by adopting this constitution.”

General Minutes (1895): "Resolved, That in order to remove all fear and misapprehension, this convention of the General Synod hereby expresses its entire satisfaction with the present form of doctrinal basis and confessional subscription, which is the Word of God, the infallible rule of faith and practice, and the unaltered Augsburg Confession as throughout in perfect consistence with it—nothing more, nothing less."

(1901) Minutes General Synod: "Resolved, That in these days of doctrinal unrest in many quarters, we rejoice to find ourselves unshaken in our spiritual and historic faith, and therefore we reaffirm our unreserved alliance to the present basis of the General Synod, and we hold that to make any distinction between fundamental and so-called non-fundamental doctrines in the Augsburg Confession is contrary to that basis set forth in our formula of confessional subscription." The General Synod has adopted the translation of the Augsburg Confession as recommended by the joint committee of the Common Service and publishes it in the Lutheran Hymnals used in all of its Churches in its appointed worship.

In the ordination of its ministers it requires subscription to the following ordination vow: "Do you receive and hold with the Evangelical Lutheran Church of our fathers, the Word of God, as contained in the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as the only infallible rule of faith and practice, and the Augsburg Confession to be a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the Divine Word, and of the faith of the Church founded upon that Word?" To this the candidate is required to answer, "I do," Unquestionably as a matter of pure history this places the General Synod upon the only doctrinal basis required by the Lutheran Church in all its history. The General Synod has not included the other Symbolic Books, to which many of us could subscribe, because it holds that the portions which precede the Augsburg Confession were practically included in it and those which follow after were only amplifications and unfoldings or explanations of the principal Confession. As a matter of history this position cannot be questioned. The Lutheran theologians after the death of Luther, and indeed before, did not agree in all points, as all students of history know, and that cannot be expected now. Nor was there ever a

period in Church history when that became a question of citizenship in Church or State. If we take the question of citizenship as a standard in the United States, it is exceedingly simple and often is only a question of birth, yet the law sustains it. So in the history of the Church. The position of the General Synod has been amply sustained in the courts of equity both higher and lower, and no one writer or Synod or body has a right to question, challenge or criticise the loyalty of another, especially by springing the unseen question of motives in questions of Church affiliation or Synodical declarations. We make these statements from the broad standpoint of what is termed a Conservative Lutheran in the General Synod, who has the warmest feelings of loyalty to all Lutheran bodies and who hopes in the ultimate union of our beloved Church. These are facts of history concerning our Church and not the sentiments of an individual.

As an organization the General Synod is the oldest and the mother in this country. At the time of its organization (eighty-eight years ago, 1820-1908) the Lutheran Church in this country had only about 35,000 communicants. It now ranks third among the great denominations in this country, with a communicant membership of 2,054,718, 13,175 churches and 8,028 ministers. The increase in one year has been 116,087, the largest percentage of increase of all the denominations. Contributions in one year (1906) \$2,479,519.00. The Lutheran Church in the world has 75,000,000 members and exceeds all the others. She preaches the gospel in some 19 languages, no other denominations in more than three. The General Synod is the third largest of the general Lutheran bodies in this country. It has 274,191 members, 1,742 congregations and 1,316 ministers. It has all kinds of benevolent institutions and colleges and theological seminaries and publication houses and Sunday School supplies, the very best the times afford, and is doing the most splendid and efficient work. A special feature of this branch of the Church is its tendency to sustain proper fraternal relations with other churches and religious movements for the furtherance of the glory of God and the unity of faith where this can be consistently accomplished without compromising her faith or history. The increase in membership of the General Synod in ten years has been 83,597; in 25 years 143,826. If it is true that other branches of

the Lutheran Church in this country have furnished the bone and framework of Lutheranism, it is equally true that the General Synod has imparted the spirit and soul of Lutheranism to the Church in this country. The General Synod whilst always loyally adhering to the Confession of our fathers has always stood for a higher spiritual life and for a practical piety which tends to bring souls into the kingdom of such as shall be saved. If Luther was a man of doctrine he was still more a man of devotion and prayer and ever stood firmly for a practical piety which is evidenced in all his writings and in his Catechisms for the Church. The General Synod without compromising or lessening her respect for the faith and confessions of the fathers in the Church, by her affiliation in practical affairs in Christian work and her Christly spirit to sister denominations has won a place in the hearts of all Christians and for the Lutheran Church in general, which has given the Church of our fathers a new and higher place in Christendom and has vastly increased her influence and power and removed much of the wrong impressions concerning our Church which so long retarded our progress. These are facts not to be lightly esteemed. Her members love our historic faith as truly and deeply as any others can. We take second place to none in this. Her Sunday Schools, her Young People's Societies and her united efforts in federation by representation with general movements of common Christian effort has vastly increased her efficiency and strengthened the Lutheran Church in general. If the "Field is the World," as the Master said, then we must enter the world. Cardinal Gibbons of the Catholic Church in the United States, delivered an address in Westminster, London, at the Eucharistic Congress held there in September (1908) in which he said: "Though we are separated from you by an immense ocean, we are united with you, thank God, in the heritage of a common faith. He cited a long line of popes and worthies in the Apostolic Succession." We as Protestants and especially as Lutherans, can make a still greater claim. Religious faith has been one and the same throughout the ages. The Almighty has not in the history of Revelation and worship changed the cardinal principle of that righteous faith once for all delivered to the saints on earth. Truth and the principles of righteousness are as eternal as God. Forms,

ceremonies and symbols and seals and signs may change with the development of God's purposes in the Church—but God's Word and holy life and relations to God and eternity and the life beyond are eternal in themselves. When God made a covenant with Abraham, renewed in Isaac, Jacob and continued in David and Judah, He made that covenant with their rightful descendants forever. The covenant with David—a sacred covenant of salt—and in Solomon and the temple was an everlasting covenant. Though the ceremonial passed away and the people were merged into the Apostolic Church, the law, the Gospel, the Church, the covenants, and the spiritual life were continued unbroken. We claim a glorious heritage in a continuous faith. We go back to Abraham and the covenants for four thousand years. We come with this ancient faith as the descendants of God's people with all the covenants and promises until the heavenly proclamation to the Judean shepherds, "For unto you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour which is Christ the Lord." We pass on then to the Church as founded on Jesus Christ. We hold to this same unbroken chain of historic faith, which Peter preached on Pentecost when 3,000 souls were added to the Church. And which Paul preached at the great court of Areopagus where he was moved by the sight of the altar to the "Unknown God" and which he preached in Macedonia, the isles of the seas, and in Rome also. We hold to the same heroic faith of the Church fathers; passing on through the Dark Ages and Middle Ages of History, we come out in the glorious sunlight of the renovated Church with the same gospel in the immortal Martin Luther, the founder of our Church and the real author under God of our splendid creedal faith as contained in the Augustana. With the believers and faithful of the followers of this Confession we cross the ocean to this new land with our Anglo Saxon fathers and mothers. In the Dutch, Swedes and Germans we continue our splendid heritage of faith in our historic Church. By them we are united to the great universities and theologians and faith of the Fatherland. We look upon Muhlenberg as the Patriarch of this heritage in this country. Their sacrifices and sorrows were our sacrifices and sorrows. With mingled tears and joys we read and re-read their history and vow to be loyal to the death

to our Confessions. In the General Synod we now find our modern home, the first general body organized in this country at the suggestion of the oldest Synod (the Pennsylvania) in her institutions of learning, we have received the spirit of our fathers and in her pews we have inherited this same historic faith for which we now stand. In this glorious faith of the gospel of our Lord we live. In her Churches we confess Christ, baptize our children and in this hope we bury our beloved dead and hope for an eternal life. In all these ages and centuries and changes, our Bible, our Faith and our Church have not changed and here now we stand. Our Augsburg Confession is unaltered and unchanged. But we as Lutherans should bear towards one another that same spirit of charity which actuated the fathers, such as was in Luther, Melancthon, Muhlenberg and was manifest in the fathers and founders of the General Synod, tempered still with the Christian charity and spirit of fellowship which is one of the glories of modern Christianity. Whilst forms and ceremonies are beautiful in themselves and form helpful channels for spiritual worship; we as Lutherans must never forget that Christ is the center of all Lutheran theology and life. The Lutheran Church in the United States has furnished the best possible type of citizenship and to our armies she has given her noblest sons. We have inherited through our fathers and mothers a splendid spirit of loyalty. In three things the Lutheran Church is pre-eminent. First. She is a Church with a great history. Second. She stands for a great principle or historic faith, declared in her confession. She does not exist merely for a name. She has given to Christendom, the Bible in their native tongue and its truths in its true interpretation and her worship in its most divine conception. She is rooted and grounded in the Word of God. She holds that aloft as fundamental to all her creeds, confessions, faith and life. Third. She is a Church with a great mission. Especially in the Home Mission and Church Extension fields of this country among the hundreds of thousands of emigrants annually coming to our shores. But perhaps to preserve above all in this great country and in this great age, this pure doctrine of salvation through the atonement of Christ as set forth in the gospel. And what higher and more inspiring aim could any

body of men and women have, than to aid in and be a prominent factor in the mighty work of saving the world to Christ, truth and eternal life. With the Bible as the Word of God, with our confessions setting forth the life of faith and not of works, still holding up the discipleship of a consecrated life according to the spirit of the gospel; what a work is ours? What a responsibility is ours, men and women of the General Synod of the Lutheran Church of America and of the world! Finally: My Christian friends and followers of the Augsburg Confession, the great Magna Charta of Protestantism and of Religious Freedom: Fellow Lutherans, (Runnymede and Augsburg) (in history) (June 15, 1215 and June 25, 1530). It is a great privilege to live in a glorious age like this, the most splendid civilization of the ages of history; this wonderful Twentieth Century, a century of maturity of the thought of ages, the culmination of the ages of history, the age of possibilities and capabilities, the century of opportunities and of open doors to the world's nations. And above all in this great century to belong to a Church with such a history; to stand in the very forefront of Christianity with this historic background, facing the future as great factors in the Kingdom of God and His Christ and thus to labor for the uplift of our fellowmen and that kingdom for the establishment of which the Son of God endured the cross. But remember that it is also attended with great responsibilities. May each one of us prove a soldier worthy of our history and confession.

Milton, Pa.

ARTICLE XI.

REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

A. C. ARMSTRONG & SON. NEW YORK.

Jerusalem, the Topography, Economics and History, From the Earliest Times to A. D., 70. By George Adam Smith, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Old Testament Language, Literature and Theology, United Free Church, Glasgow, Author of "The Historical Geography of the Holy Land," etc. In two Volumes, with Maps and Illustrations. Cloth. Vol. I, Pp. xx, 498; Vol. II, Pp. xi, 631. Price \$7.50 complete.

This is a monumental work, the product of faithful and intelligent toil for a quarter of a century by one who to the patience of the investigator adds the sound judgment of an acknowledged master in Old Testament lore. No spot on earth is invested with deeper interest to the Christian than the City "chosen of God, a singular city, with a mission to mankind." What fearful tragedies she has witnessed! What terrible catastrophies she has endured! Beside the earthquakes which have periodically rocked her foundations, the City has endured nearly twenty sieges, and assaults of the utmost severity, and almost twenty more blockades or military occupations. She was "the bride of kings and the mother of prophets." The former enriched her with the spoils of war and the treasures of merchandise; the latter glorified her as the City of the Most High and lamented over her decay and foreseen devastation. The charm of antiquity surrounds her. She was already the home of a mysterious Priest in the days of Abraham. She was taken by David and others because she was the capital of the land and the seat of her kings. The hosts of mighty empires have trodden her under foot; but she has always risen from ruin and defeat. The chief interest, however, that invests her arises from the spiritual struggles that have taken place within her walls. Here the Spirit of God and the spirit of man have engaged in awful contest as nowhere else. Here was enacted the tragedy of the Cross. Hither come the devout of Christian lands to trace the footsteps of the Son of God.

The reader of these volumes is impressed with the comprehensiveness of the presentation. Nothing of interest has escaped the author. The site, the buildings, the food and water supply,

the climate, the politics, the history—everything that can be said or known at this time receives fair consideration.

We are also impressed with the thoroughness of the work. The author has not only studied all available records, but has made personal investigations of the most painstaking character. He has weighed facts and evidences bearing on disputed points and presented matured convictions. Scholars may differ from him on some points, but none can ignore his opinions and conclusions.

The matter is presented in an attractive literary style, not entirely faultless but always clear and often eloquent. There is no evidence that there has been any effort simply to make a book. Much of these volumes will be read with interest by all biblical scholars. Some parts, however, will be passed over by the average reader as too minute and technical.

The publishers deserve commendation for the make-up of these volumes. Paper, press-work, illustrations and maps are all excellent.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

The Cities of St. Paul. Their Influence on His Life and Thought By Sir W. M. Ramsay, Kt., Hon. D.C.L. etc. Professor of Humanity in the University of Aberdeen. 8vo. Pp. 452.

A reconstruction of the history of Paul's motives, qualities, and labors, is developed in the various writings of Professor Ramsay. His travels and residence in Asia Minor, his study of ruins of ancient cities, associated with Paul's labors, his examination, on the site, of their monuments and remains, qualify Professor Ramsay to speak authoritatively on the historic and geographical phases of Paul's career.

This volume is the *Dale Memorial Lectures* delivered 1907, in Mansfield College, Oxford. The general title, however, is too broad, for Professor Ramsay treats only of five cities associated with the life of Paul: Tarsus, Pisidian Antioch, Iconium, Derbe, and Lystra.

Professor Ramsay has written and published much on his favorite theme, and with scholarly research, and has given a wealth of information and suggested reconstruction—material relative to Paul's field of labor and purpose of missionary enterprise. But considerable parts of his material overlap. He should now systematize his material, and give more succinct and scientific form to his published lectures. His desire to forget nothing of discovery and suggested interpretation causes him to write continuously amid his investigations, sometimes to the

watering of the product. But we all owe a great debt to Professor Ramsay for his researches and labors.

M. COOVER.

A Short Grammar of the Greek New Testament. By A. T. Robertson, A.M., D.D., Professor of New Testament Interpretation, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. 12mo. Pp. 240.

This handy volume by Dr. Robertson is a useful handbook for the New Testament student of Greek. It is not so elementary as Huddleston's or Green's, and not so comprehensive and exhaustive as the work of Blass, or Moulton. Nor is the volume a mere beginner's book, since paradigms and elementary principles are not given. Such details of language construction are supposed to have been acquired by the student in his study of classic Greek. Dr. Robertson's Grammar meets the felt want of the busy pastor, and the practical New Testament student.

M. COOVER.

STUDENT DEPARTMENT, YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION.
NEW YORK.

The Future Leadership of the Church... By John R. Mott, M.A., General Secretary of the World's Student Christian Federation. Cloth. Pp. ix, 208.

This stirring volume from the pen and from the heart of a great Christian worker sounds the trumpet call to the Church on the subject of the ministry. The discussion is presented in five chapters: The Problem, The Urgency, The Obstacles, The Favoring influences, and The Propaganda. The book is fairly packed with facts gleaned from wide fields through reading the personal intercourse with great men in many lands. After presenting the fact of the undoubted decline in the number of candidates for the ministry, and also of the great demand for more, and for the best of leaders, he assigns various causes which deter able young men from entering the ministry. These are principally the following four: Lack of proper effort to lead men into the ministry; the secular or utilitarian spirit of the age; the attraction of the so-called secular pursuits together with the opportunities for service offered to the Christian layman in such pursuits; preparatory studies which automatically divert young men from the ministry.

The principal agencies under God for recruiting the ministry are the Christian home and the ministry itself. The teacher, too, may exert a powerful influence. The denominational col-

lege rather than the State university must be depended on for candidates.

The book is well written and deserves a very wide circulation not only among the clergy but also among the laity. To the former it is well nigh indispensable. It will do much to arouse the Church to solve the great problem set forth.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

MOFFAT, YARD & CO. NEW YORK.

Science and Immortality. By Sir Oliver Lodge, F.R.S. Cloth. Pp. 294. Price \$2.50 net.

The eminent author of *Science and Immortality* writes most interestingly upon his great theme, and in a literary style which possesses the charm of that of Benjamin Franklin. His conclusions on the great matter of the Personality of God and the immortality of man are in accord with the Christian faith. But alas! when he comes to the discussion of the person of Christ, he finds in him only a God-filled man. His miracles, transfiguration and resurrection are all legends, not indeed without their lessons, but largely inventions. The atonement likewise is repulsive to the author and without any ground in fact. The reconciliation of God is to him absurd.

Our author is a great man, with illusions. He is no doubt an authority as a physicist, but not as a philosopher or theologian. We fear that his latest work can not be regarded as a contribution to Christian literature. His faith in clairvoyance arouses suspicion as to the soundness of his judgment on physical and spiritual matters.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

Religion and Medicine. By Elwood Worcester, D.D., Ph.D., Samuel McComb, M.A., D.D., Isador H. Coriat, M.D. Pp. 427. \$1.50 net.

The leaders of the Emanuel movement feel that beneath the crude and contradictory basis of Christian science lies a power which is able to confer great benefit on the believer. Doubting the cure of organic disease by psychical means, they believe that neurasthenic diseases can be thus cured, and that the Church should be the physician. They take their stand "fairly and squarely on the religion of Christ as that religion is revealed in the New Testament, and as it is interpreted by modern scholarship," and they claim "to have combined with this the power of genuine science." *Religion and Medicine* is a very interesting presentation of their principles and methods, and though it con-

tains no facts which are new to the students of either medicine or religion, it will doubtless help many sufferers who need constantly to be led back to the paths of self-control and common sense. The chapters on "The Healing Wonders of Christ," and on the therapeutic power of faith and prayer are as beautiful and inspiring as the more technical chapters are interesting. It is the knowledge and research which the latter exhibit, which fortifies us in our belief that it is impossible for the clergyman ever to take upon himself the problems which belong to the great psychologist or alienist. Nor is it either necessary or desirable that he should. If he accomplishes his task in the cure of souls, the dependent bodily cure will follow. The general impression of reasonableness which the book gives us is somewhat impaired by the claim that anger, violence, disposition to lie, and other unfortunate habits of children may be removed by suggestions given them during sleep. Such a process resembles too closely the "absent treatment" of the Christian Scientist.

E. S.

BAPTIST WORLD PUBLISHING CO.

A Guide to the Study of Church History. By W. J. McGlothlin, Ph.D., (Berlin), D.D., Professor of Church History in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky. Cloth. Pp. 264.

This volume is intended for beginners in the study of Church History. The author endeavors to present the matter in a "form so compact as to appeal to the eye and be easily remembered and at the same time to direct the student to wider reading on various subjects." He has essayed a difficult task. It seems to us that such a compact array of data must be difficult for the student to acquire. Condensed food is not wholesome without dilution. A barren array of facts without the motion and life of the actual story is not apt to interest.

Dr. McGlothlin's book is better adapted as a review than a preview of Church History. As such it may be of use as a handbook on the student's desk.

Judging from the brief paragraph devoted to Lutherans in America, we are bound to say that the author has not mastered his subject. To justify this statement we quote the paragraph.

"Lutherans have had much strife and division, have lost great numbers to other denominations and to irreligion; grown only by births and immigration; now over 1,000,000 of several nationalities, types of life, etc., each with its own organizations and

work; German and English used in services; many shades of opinion and difference in practice."

According to this estimate Lutherans have done little else than quarrel and decrease. There have been no conversions from the world. They do not appear as having many flourishing schools and mission stations. Their number is given at just one-half of the actual fact. The author, who received his Ph.D in Berlin, does not seem to know that the Lutheran Church is a polyglot body—English, German, Swedish, Norwegian, Danish, Icelandic, Finnish and Slavonak. One Swedish synod alone has over a thousand ministers and one hundred and fifty thousand members.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY. NEW YORK.

The Epistle to the Hebrews. By Edgar J. Goodspeed, Assistant Professor of Biblical and Patristic Greek in the University of Chicago. Pp. xi, 132. Price 50c.

This volume belongs to the series happily named *The Bible for Home and School*, of which Dr. Shailer Mathews is the General Editor. The purpose of the series is to furnish a brief commentary, which, while thoroughly up-to-date, excludes all *processes* both critical and exegetical, giving the reader results in plain notes. It is intended for intelligent Christian people, especially Sunday School teachers. We are sure that ministers will not disdain to use it.

The volume before us carries out the outlined purpose admirably. The Introduction, comments, and indices are all that could be desired in so brief a space. Judged by this volume, the series deserves commendation, and a wide circulation. For convenience, adaptation, simplicity and real helpfulness we know of no commentary which excells this one.

The publishers have given the commentary an excellent make-up at an almost nominal price.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

The Educational Ideal in the Ministry. The Lyman Beecher Lectures at Yale University in the year 1908. By William Herbert Perry Faunce, President of Brown University. Pp. 286. Price \$1.50.

This book consists of eight chapters under the following titles: "The Place of the Ministry in Modern Life;" "The Attitude of Religious Leaders Toward New Truth;" "Modern Use of Ancient Scripture;" "The Demand for Ethical Leadership;" "The

Service of Psychology;" "The Direction of Religious Education;" "The Relation of the Church and the College;" "The Education of the Minister by His Task."

After having read this book through we are prepared to pronounce it one of the most thoughtful and serviceable of the series to which it belongs. It is positive in its insistence that preaching must present the truth revealed in the Bible, but it must present this with reference to present intelligence, present needs and present duties. To do this the preacher should be trained in the current thought, and should be able to speak the language of today. But at this point we think the author lays too little emphasis on scientific theological training. It does not follow that a man must necessarily be less practical because he can consult the Hebrew and the Greek Scriptures. It is better and safer always to drink from the fountain than from the stream.

Nor do we agree with the author when he depreciates "eloquence." Of course this is not the day for the stately sermonic orators. But no preaching can be effective which is not delivered with clear and distinct enunciation, and with that fervid energy which springs from the conviction that this is the truth which he speaks, and that its acceptance or rejection is a matter of life or death with the hearer.

The chapter which we regard as of special value is that on *The Service of Psychology*. Only the other day we were told by a theological student that he had been advised by a clergyman to let philosophy alone—"It will do you no good." Our judgment is that there is no class of educated men more deficient in acquaintance with philosophy, and no class that needs it more, than the clergy. And it is an indisputable fact that almost every great preacher of the Church has been well versed in philosophy. We have but to name the two Gregorys of the Greek Church, Chrysostom, Augustine, Bernard, Aquinas, Luther, who taught Aristotle for four years, and Reinhard, who was also a professor of philosophy.

The last named, undoubtedly the greatest German preacher living a hundred years ago, most heartily commends the study of philosophy by the preacher, especially psychology and ethics—not that the preacher should take philosophical topics into the pulpit, but that he may be assisted in analyzing his subject. Were we to offer a general criticism of the preaching of the present time, it would be that it lacks exactly that clearness and directness that come from the deeper look into the nature and the relations of things.

The psychology recommended by our author is that which is able to interpret the experiences of men; that "shows us the un-

reality of many conventional sins and traditional virtues;" that gives "a knowledge of the mutual inter-relation and inter-dependence of mind and body;" that understands the relation of the intelligence, the feelings and the will to each other; that shows the relation of action to the development of character; that gives insight into the meaning of adolescence.

Throughout the author lays emphasis on the *teaching* function of the minister, and pays a fine compliment to the Lutheran pastor, who spends much of his time teaching the young people of his charge. The author modestly claims that his book gives no information on any subject, but only "a point of view."

Well, the point of view is very fine. It enables us to see some things that we had not seen before, and to see some things in an intenser light, and some things differently from what we had previously seen them. We commend the reading of the book to all preachers, young, middle-aged and old.

J. W. RICHARD.

School Reports and School Efficiency. By David S. Snedden, Ph.D., and William H. Allen, Ph.D. For the New York Committee on Physical Welfare of School Children. 1908. Pp. xi, 183.

When one learns that the adoption of business methods in conducting our public schools has resulted promptly in savings here of \$200,000, there of \$300,000, now of \$13,000 on lead pencils, again of \$113,000 on coal, one wishes to know some of the details of the method used in getting the sounder economic basis. When it is said that "our buildings, our curriculum, and our home study are manufacturing more defects than the physician and nurse and dispensary can correct," we are desirous of getting acquainted with the remedy. A committee in New York has done much to throw light on various phases of the public school question by having a number of scientifically conducted investigations made. Some of the results have been published, and many of our larger cities have profited by them. In the work we have before us one phase of school administration has received special attention: school efficiency derived from a study of school reports. Our book offers us well tabulated concrete evidences from properly classified school statistics. It shows the purpose of educational statistics, registers the beginnings of school reports in American cities, discusses the efforts of the National Educational Association to improve them and to secure uniformity. It gives more than one hundred examples of tables and forms presenting school facts, used in typical school reports. It follows these by brief comments showing the merits or deficiencies of the more important forms. A number of important

questions not answered by existing reports is next raised. The work closes with important suggestions for economy and improvements in the reports and brings everything to a focus with a practical study of the school report of New York City.

Our public school system is not without serious defects. Its demands upon health and wealth have been and are in excess of the returns given. Nothing will be so effective in ameliorating the condition of the city public school as the accurate, comprehensive, up-to-date report, which can capture and hold the interest of the intelligent public. Our book goes far to inaugurate a better administration if its advice be heeded. It is a welcome accession to school economy.

JOHN O. EVJEN.

EATON & MAINS. NEW YORK.

The Beliefs of Unbelief. Studies in the Alternatives to Faith.

By W. H. Fitchett, B.A., LL.D., Author of "How England Saved Europe," etc. Cloth. Pp. 293. Price \$1.25 net.

The well-chosen title of this book defines its contents. The so-called unbelievers are often the most credulous of men. Having rejected the faith of the Church they "believe a lie." We have known men to discredit the word of prophecy to accept the vagaries of spiritualism or the absurdities of Christian Science.

Dr. Fitchett handles his theme in a popular and telling manner. The reasoning is cogent, the language plain and the effect of perusal convincing. It is a book for pastors and laymen, and ought to be passed around among doubters.

Both sides of the problems considered are ably presented. The discussion concerning God offers first the statement of the Christian Creed and "The Evidences for Faith in God." Then "the alternative to belief in God" is set forth. The themes "Christ" and "The Bible" are similarly treated.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

The Incarnation and Recent Criticism. By R. J. Cooke, D.D.

Octavo. Cloth. Pp. 243. Price \$1.50 net.

This is one of the very best presentations of the great theme of the Incarnation. While the book is learned and critical, evading nothing because of intrinsic difficulty, it will be read with interest and profit by all intelligent Christians who have kept in touch with the scientific thought of the day. It effectually answers the false assumptions of negative critics such as Cheyne and Pfleiderer. The positive evidence of "the virgin birth" and the divinity of Christ are ably presented from the stand-

point of exegesis and reason. He shows that the knowledge of the supernatural birth of our Lord must be regarded as a necessary presupposition in the minds of the writers of the gospels and epistles. The chapter on "Who Was Jesus?" is a simple and powerful argument from history, prophecy and experience, showing that he was none other than God incarnate.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

Foreign Religious Series. Edited by R. J. Cooke, D.D.

This series of booklets serves a useful educational purpose in the busy world. There are many men interested in religious questions, who become more or less troubled by the popular rationalistic conceptions abroad concerning the Bible and its teachings. Neither time nor adaptation is frequently furnished to study extensive works which develop in detail and completeness a full defense of Christian belief.

These monographs bring to the busy man a succinct statement of rationalistic criticism of the Word of God, and its fundamental doctrines, and a brief summary of defensive argument in proof of the historicity of the divine word, and the consistency of its teachings.

Conservative positions are defended by scholarly men, who bring their experience and learning to bear on the most debated portions of revelation and doctrine. It is not necessary to subscribe to every statement of the several authors, nor to find fault with inadequacy of treatment. Monographs are not systems of doctrine, nor a full apologetic, and some liberty of opinion must be allowed to thinking men. The following four booklets bear on living subjects in the theological thought of today:

The Virgin Birth. By Professor Richard H. Gruetzmacher, of the University of Rostock.

The Resurrection of Jesus. By Professor Eduard Riggenschach, of the University of Basle.

The Miracles of Jesus. By Professor Karl Beth, of the University of Berlin.

The Gospel of John and the Synoptic Gospels. By Professor Fritz Barth, of the University of Bern.

M. COOVER.

The Book and the Child. By John T. McFarland, D.D. Price each, 5 cents; by mail 7 cents; per dozen, 50 cents; by mail, 63 cents.

This booklet contains the discussion of two articles of what the author terms, "Some Vital Principles for a Sunday School Platform." The first has to do with "The Book," and maintains

the proposition that the Sunday School is set pre-eminently for the teaching of the Bible. Touching the Bible three things are asserted, namely, it is the Word of God, it is an inspired book, and it is the record of God's greatest revelation. The aim of the author is to promote Bible study in the Sunday School. His chief criticism of the method now in vogue is, that it is fragmentary, piecemeal, occupies itself too much with texts, utterly fails in perspective. His plea is for the recognition of what is undoubtedly true, that this revelation came to men at different times, that these different times represent stages in the divine unfolding, and that each book or part of that record must be seen in the light of the period to which it belongs.

The second article deals with the religious status and rights of the child. The point of particular interest is, that extreme Calvinism, which holds every child to be the child of the devil, is repudiated. Take a sentence or two as a sample of his earnest disavowal. "I know a few preachers who hold this view as a traditional matter of theology, but I do not know of one who has ever dared to preach it at a child's funeral. If the *dead* child is God's child, I make bold to believe, and find great comfort in believing, that the *living* child is God's child. I have yet to learn that death is a sacrament for the purging away of corruption. But the blood of Jesus Christ has infinite power of cleansing, and every child born into the world has been born under the unconditional grace and saving power of the atonement." This must suffice to indicate the author's position. And we are able to give our assent to what Dr. McFarland has here written, in almost every particular. One or two points it were well to guard a little better than has been done. That many of his fellow Methodists are reluctant to hear this gospel of childhood, are even ready to brand as heretical those who receive it, gives the author painful surprise. He is at a loss to explain it. It is no mystery to the reviewer. His surprise would come if the reverse were true. Dr. McFarland has earnest convictions on the important subjects here discussed, and he presents them in strong, forcible language, accompanied by fresh, illuminating illustration.

LUTHER KUHLMAN.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS. NEW YORK.

A History of the Ancient Egyptians. By James Henry Breasted, Ph.D., Professor of Egyptian and Oriental History in the University of Chicago. Pp. xiii, 467.

This volume is one of the historical series for Bible students prepared under the joint editorship of Drs. Kent and Sanders.

It gives a connected history of the people of the Nile Valley whose civilization is now conceded to be a thousand years older than that of the Euphrates. Dr. Breasted is master of a fluent and attractive style, and at the touch of his facile pen the shadowy dwellers in this land of shrivelled mummies, ruined temples and broken monuments, whose beginning dates back to 4500 B. C., are made to pass before us as Pharaohs' military chieftans, feudal lords and court dignitaries as realistically as if they had played their parts in life's drama but yesterday.

The story of Hatchepset, the "Queen Bess" of Egypt, has been greatly changed from the earlier accounts of her life. The same is also true of the orthography of some familiar names. Thutmose used to be Thotmes. Harmhab Horcueheb and Ikhuabre Khurcuaton. We presume a larger study of the language has made these changes necessary.

It is regretted that our author felt called upon to introduce his extreme radical views regarding the structure of the Old Testament. For example we are gravely told that the story of Joseph in Potiphar's house has been appropriated from the "Tale of Two Brothers." The Exodus, which to the Hebrew mind was the most signal display of God's under working power in all their history, and which left its unfading impulses upon poet, historian and prophet, is to the author of this book nothing more than the escape from oppression of a tribe of the ancestors of the Hebrew nation. Dr. Breasted is unquestionably a great authority in Oriental history.

T. C. BILLHEIMER.

Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics. Edited by James Hastings, M.A., D.D., etc., etc., with the assistance of John A. Selbie, M.A., D.D., and other scholars. Vol. I. A-Art. Quarto. Pp. 903. Price \$7.00 net, cloth. \$9.00 in Half Morocco. Sold only in complete sets. "The work will consist of about ten volumes."

The Dictionary of the Bible and the Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels have established the reputation of Dr. Hastings as an editor of works such as the one now before us. Indeed the promise is evident that in this Encyclopedia he will even eclipse his former fame. This work when completed will be truly gigantic. In the volume before us we find an article on almost every word, thing and name beginning with A that occurs or has ever occurred in connection with Religion, Ethics and Philosophy, and some of the articles are treated at great length. Thirteen columns, each containing more than six hundred words, are given to "Absolute." More than thirty columns are given to

"Adultery." Nine columns are devoted to "Aeschylus," the Greek tragedian. "Agape" is discussed in eighteen columns. Forty-four columns are devoted to "Ages of the World," twenty-one to "Agnosticism," and the same number to "Alexandrian Theology." "Animals" are treated in one hundred and four columns. To "Anthropology" is allotted twenty-four columns, and to "Apostolic Succession" sixteen. One hundred and ninety-two columns (text and illustrations) treat of "Architecture." "Aristotle" and "Aristotelianism" get eight and a half. "Art," including fourteen pages of "Illustrations," extends from pages 817 to page 903.

This somewhat mathematical description will help to inform the reader of this notice of the comprehensiveness of the work. In most cases the non-professional reader will find here all the information on a given subject that he needs or cares to acquire, and as a rule the specialist cannot afford to overlook the discussion given to subjects on which he may be in search of information and of opinions.

We have not, to be sure, read a large number of the articles, for a dictionary, or an encyclopedia, is intended for consultation, and not for continuous reading. But we have read several which have specially interested us. We found the treatment in every case thoughtful, scientific and accurate. They were written by men of scholarly attainments. The treatment may be regarded, not as *final*, for no science has yet reached its *finis*, but as exhibiting the latest and best information on the subjects in question. And in addition, an ample bibliography is attached to all important articles. Many of the authors have world-wide reputation for scholarship along lines on which they have here furnished articles. Hence, looking at the many features of excellence in this Encyclopedia, we heartily commend it to professors in every department of theology and philosophy, of history and literature, and to the ministry in general. It points the way towards scholarly and efficient work. We eagerly desire the speedy publication of the remaining volumes promised.

J. W. RICHARD.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN. COLUMBUS, OHIO.

Mission Studies. Outlines of Missionary Principles and Practice. By Edward Pfeiffer. Price 75 cents net, postage 10 cents. Orders should be addressed to the author: Edward Pfeiffer, 1091 Franklin Ave., Columbus, Ohio.

The material presented in this book is comprehended under two general parts. In the first part are discussed missionary

principles in general, yet with particular reference to foreign missions. The introductory section includes such topics as the science of Christian missions, the scope of the missionary principles, and the place of missions in theology and in Christianity. The next section deals with the unity and the diversity of the missionary enterprise, the missionary and his qualifications, the purpose and aim of missions, and their ground. The ground of missionary work as contained in the Scripture, in Christian doctrine and duty, and in the Christian Church as a missionary institution, is wrought out with special care and fulness. This is one of the most valuable parts of the book. In the two following chapters, the means and methods employed, and the chief lines along which missionary work is usually conducted, are presented.

The second part has to do with home missions proper, inner missions, and the nurture of the missionary life in the home Church. Under the first topic there is a discussion of the field and aim of home missions, its forces and methods. The distinctive sphere of inner missions is defined, and its principal methods indicated. The concluding section contains helpful suggestion and instruction for the creation and development of the missionary life in the home Church. An appendix contains a few supplementary notes, a bibliography, and an index.

The aim of the reviewer has been to present a clear view of the contents of this book, assured that this, better than any word of commendation by him, will enable the pastor or teacher who may read this notice to decide whether or not the book will be helpful to him and his work. Literature upon every phase of this great and fundamental subject is bewilderingly abundant. And it is daily increasing. Yet there was and is a place for this particular book. We are glad for the necessity which constrained the author to prepare and publish it. The discussions while not exhaustive, are clear, comprehensive, and thoroughly Scriptural. The task Dr. Pfeiffer set himself was, to present missionary principles and methods in outline, as a basis for the intelligent grasp of the whole subject, and as an incentive for progressive study and energetic prosecution of the work. We know of no other book in which this task has been so satisfactorily performed. As a chief authority in his subject the author recognizes Dr. Warneck. In this he is right. But he is not narrow. Such well-known experts as Dennis, Bliss, Speer, Mott, and Brown and others, are frequently referred to. If adequately advertised it should find a wide sale among our Lutheran pastors and ministerial students and missionary workers.

LUTHER KUHLMAN.

WARTBURG PUBLISHING HOUSE. CHICAGO, ILL.

Wilhelm Löhe. Ein Lebensbild von Karl Eichner... (Zweite Auflage. Chicago, Ill.: Wartburg Publishing House. 1908. Pp. 173. Price 70 cents.)

In this little book the pastor of the allgemeines Krankenhaus in Nürnberg gives us, from the view-point of the Neuendettelsauer, a charming description of great Wilhelm Löhe—for Löhe was truly great: great as a personality, great in the pulpit, great before the altar, great at the bedside of the sick and the dying. It is largely due to him that the early German settlers in our West were so early provided with self-sacrificing ministers of evangelical piety and confessional fidelity, and that not the entire German West turned Missourian. He trained not only ministers for America, but also missionaries for the Indians. But his real life work was laid down in Neuendettelsau where he took the lead in so many charity movements, built the celebrated deaconess home, trained deaconesses, preached his wonderful sermons, and wrote his instructive books. It was in reference to Löhe that Vilmar said, "None since Göthe has written such German." And Ranke paid him no mean tribute when he said he showed aptitude for the vocation of an historian. Löhe's postils are well known. He knew both how to preach and what to preach. His sermons were plain, but vigorous, singularly free from the artificial divisions and subdivisions, that his times loved to dally with. He did not stoop to address his congregation, which numbered many peasants, as if speaking to children. It was rather the other way: it would seem that he at times preached "over their heads." Nevertheless, these peasants remember to this day just what Löhe had to say on this or that pericope. His preaching was Scriptural. It was rendered, if possible, more impressive, by the liturgy. He loved the altar service, which he considered more beautiful than all the poetry of the world. It was natural for Löhe to serve at the altar, it was nothing affected or savoring of mannerism. In *his* hands a high-liturgy—he had his private Agenda—was full of ennobling beauty, elevating power. Though his idea of the Church and the ministerial office has often—and not without some cause—been accused of Romanism, he protested against the suspicion of leaning toward Rome.

Above everything else Löhe was pastor. Pictured as he is in Eichner's biography, one cannot help feeling the greatness of the ministry and wishing that the Löhes were more abundant in our own land. How touching those lines describing his sadness, his yearning after preaching when he, after graduation, had to

wait several years before he was entrusted with a congregation. How interesting, the description of his beautiful home life, the care of his children, the cherishing of a beloved wife's memory. Löhe was learning all his life. This is clearly brought out by Eichner, who even notes his growing leniency on the confessional question. The strictness of the earlier years gave way to the sweeter reasonableness of maturer years.

Löhe's writings were numerous. They deserve abiding consideration in many ways. Eichner's estimates as to their value we can commend to the reader, as we commend the entire book. Such an uplifting character study will cheer both minister and congregation. It should be translated into English.

J. O. EVJEN.

THE AUGUSTANA BOOK CONCERN. ROCK ISLAND, ILL.

The Psalms. Translated and commented upon. By Emil Lund. Pp. 690.

The purpose of the author of this work is "to give the reader of the Holy Scriptures a brief interpretation of our old, dear Psalter in a scientific though popular form." It contains a lengthy Introduction in which are discussed the Meaning of the Musical Instruments, the Titles, the Authors and Dates of Composition, the Divisions, Contents and Purpose of the Psalms. Then follows the Translation with the Comments. The book has some blemishes: the English is not always idiomatic, the translations are sometimes too literal, and there is too much reference to the Hebrew to make comfortable reading for the average Bible student. But these are mere trifles. The author brings to his task a profound love and veneration for the Book and a childlike faith in its truthfulness. To him the Psalter still is the inspired Word of God. While not ignoring them entirely, the author gives but scant consideration to the "assured results" of radical criticism. The pre-exilic, post-exilic and Maccabean classifications do not trouble him; he is content to follow the traditional view. For this reason the book will be refreshing and satisfying to nearly all its readers. The Comments are sound, practical and profitable. We heartily commend the volume to all who will hold fast to the faith of their fathers' Church.

T. C. BILLHEIMER.

JOY IN THE DIVINE GOVERNMENT,

A VOLUME

—OF—

Sermons by the late Dr. L. A. GOTWALD,

Professor in Wittenberg Seminary,

SPRINGFIELD, OHIO.

Sent postpaid, as long as the supply lasts, on receipt of \$1.10.

Contains fifteen most edifying discourses by this well-known preacher, with Introduction by Prof. Henry E. Jacobs. The volume contains 325 pages and is very handsomely published by Revell & Co., Chicago.

Send all orders to

Rev. F. G. GOTWALD,

YORK, PA.

CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY.

By M. VALENTINE, D.D., LL.D.

A most valuable book dealing with living questions of theology. The author's discussions of the Trinity, of Creation, of the Evolutionary Theory, of the Modern Explanation of Sin, are examples of this. He displays consciousness of strength. He states the position of the adversary fairly and without heat, because he has for himself gone over the field and discovered his weakness and reached what he believes to be the truth. It is the mark of the strong thinker. Dr. Valentine had a strong grasp on the central truths of our Lutheran Theology and frankly considers them and states his belief.

Cloth, 8 vo. 2 vols. \$5.00.

The Atonement and Modern Thought.

By J. B. REMENSNYDER, D.D., LL.D.

In a recent letter from the famous Biblical scholar, Prof. James Orr, of Glasgow, Scotland, he says about this book, "I am much impressed with the clearness, fullness and Scriptural character, free from exaggerations and sensationalisms, of its presentation of the cardinal article of our faith. I fear there is a wide divorce from the Scripture doctrine of Atonement in many minds of the present time. This is connected with changed views of the world, of man's origin, of the character of sin, and is, perhaps, a revolt against a too hard and exclusively legal mode of presenting this great doctrine. The tendency has, at any rate, to be met, and I think your book should do something to clarify the minds and settle the ideas of soberly thinking people."

Cloth, 12 mo. \$1.00.

THE GIST OF THE SERMON.

By HERBERT C. ALLEMAN, D.D.

The reading of this volume will be both pleasurable and profitable. Profitable because it is a rich, stimulating exposition of one of the most variously interpreted and most misunderstood, and withal, most interesting books of the Bible,—Ecclesiastes. Pleasurable because of the transparent style in which this exposition has been set forth, the beauty of the diction, the fine phrasing and the wealth of apposite illustrative material gathered from many fields. Its pleasing appearance, clear type, good spacing, and generally tasteful dress, invite a reading, and those who accept the invitation will find themselves abundantly rewarded.

Cloth, 12 mo. 75 cts.

The Lutheran Publication Society

HENRY S. BONEH, Superintendent,
1424 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

